

A
DEFENCE
OF THE
VINDICATION
OF THE
Church of Scotland,
In ANSWER to an
APOLOGY
OF THE
CLERGY of SCOTLAND.



EDINBURGH,

Printed by *GEORGE MOSMAN* and are to be Sold at his
Shop in the *Parliament Cloſe*, in the Year 1707.

A
D E F E N D E
O F T H E
V I D E O
O F T H E
C h u r c h o f S c o t l a n d
A P O L O G Y
O F T H E
C L E R G Y o f S C O T L A N D



EDINBURGH

Printed by G. GORDON, at the Edinburgh Press, in the Year 1792.

Defence of the Vindication of the Church of Scotland, in Answer to an Apology for the Clergy of Scotland.



I Shall not pretend (as our *Apologift* doth) to have been forced into this Work, by the Authority of some great Man, tho' I may, with as much sincerity, averr, that I have no pleasure in this Eristick Exercise: Especially on a subject that bringeth with it a necessity of a Reflecting, and blaming of others, with whom I had rather live in peace and good correspondence; whatever different sentiments I may have from theirs, in some things. The necessity that Truth and Innocency shou'd be vindicated, and it not being done by them who could do it to more advantage, is that which prevailleth with me to undertake this unpleasant Task. Notwithstanding, if this Author had not engaged in some Theological debates occasioned by some passages in some of my former Books, it is like his abusive, and unjust Reproaches, against me and others, who he is pleased to name, should not have brought me into this Debate with him. As his squeamishness made my Book ly by him six Months, till he was over powered by commands to take it up and read it; so did his ly by me for some Months, through the throng of other Affairs, that I look on as of more moment and necessity: The *Apologift* should have had great advantage against his Antagonist, if all these things with which he chargeth him were manifest from the Book he relateth, or could be otherwise made appear: And if he himself had thuned these things that he doth, with such contempt, blame in others, but if neither of these can be observed (as I suppose will appear to the impartial Reader) he is like to have little credit by this his Essay.

S. 2. It is a wonder if this Author believeth all that he writteth of them that he setteth for his mark, and shooteth all the invenomed Arrows against, that his quiver can afford: And if he, mean while, used no Reflection, whereby to discover the very same errors in his own Book, which he so tragically exposeth in that he relateth; But it is not rare to spy a Mote in our Brothers Eye; when there is a Beam in our own. It is an old Observation, *ubi invidia & odium in consilio sunt, caecum est ibi iudicium*, and the wise Seneca did well observe, *plerique sunt diserti in convitiis suum, quos si audias in avaritiam, in libidinem &c. Perorantes, indicium sui patris professores, ita redundant in ipsos maliditatem publicanorum; quos non aliter intrinsece doces, quam medicos, quorum tituli remedia habent, pyxides venenum.* If the Fanny, Partiality and Sophistry of his Title page, the Scurrility, ill Nature, Rudeness, Tergiversation, Lying, uncharitableness; and such like qualities, that he liberally ascribeth to his Adversaries, in many places of his Book, be found with his Antagonist, and not with himself; he hath whereof

to boast; The Tryal of which will afterwards fall in, when he cometh to prove some of these benign Affections. He giveth just Grounds to think that the whole Book was written in a passion for P. 1. He telleth us, that 'every line of the Book that he refuteth provoked him to the undecencies of passion, and P. 2. that he did but once peruse it, with purpose *not to read it any more*. From which one may expect, by a natural consequence, indigested Notions, a partial Refutation, and but of some things here and there that he was most angry at, and where he thought the Attack was easiest, and a parcel of Huffing, Angry Efforts of a commoved mind: Whether this effect do not appear in the strain of his Book, I shall not determine, let the Reader judge. If there be no farther degree of passion in his Lines then what amounteth to *Indecency*, and if there be nothing worse then idle words, (of which yet we must give an account) it will be the better for him. Surely a perpetual passion, or lasting Anger, on which the *Sun goes down*, is no good temper for writing of Books. *Impedit ista animus ne possit cernere verum*. I pretend to no such prodigious parts, as to Answer his Book by Reading it once over, and whatever dislike I may have with not a few things in it, I shall consider them with out passion.

§. 3. His first head is, he will examine the general Apology, by which the *Vindicator* thinks to ward off the blame of the *Barbarous Rablings* of the Clergy, from his party: But he thinks he should have first made it appear that these *Rablings* were as *Barbarous* as his complices had represented them in their Pamphlets, Answered in the *Second Vindication*. For he knoweth, that some matters of fact by them alleged, are neither denied, nor defended, yet many of them are simply denied, and disproved, others are shewed to have been, tho' not commendable nor innocent Actions, yet far short of what they are aggravated into by these Narrators, but he is resolved to suppose all to be certain and undeniable truth, and only prove that they are imputable to the *Presbyterians* in General; and about this is our present debate with him. We maintain that these practices were acted by a very few; and not approved by either the most, or the best part of the *Presbyterians*.

§. 4. He is pleased to represent the *Vindicator's* defence in this matter, as if he held that the *Cameronians* were no *Presbyterians*, and yet they are Zealous Godly Men: And that the *Presbyterians* are clear in this, because these things were not acted by *Sober Presbyterians*, and that it is incumbent on them who blame the *Presbyterians*, to prove that the Actors in these disorders were *Sober* and *Intelligent* Men. *A*, It is easy to deform the best Face by an ill paint, and the best Cause by misrepresentation: And our Author thinketh it convenient to use this Art to make his Refutation easy which otherwise might have proved hard for him: He should have shewed, where it was said that the *Cameronians* are no *Presbyterians*: Or where it was hinted that the *Vindicator* or his complices, were obliged to prove them to be *Sober* and *Intelligent*: All that was said to this purpose was, that the *Cameronians* had gone out from the rest of the *Presbyterians*, and had taken up some principles, and used practices, that the rest did not own, nor approve, and therefore if he should prove a thousand times, that the *Cameronians* are *Presbyterians*, he saith nothing to the purpose: unless he prove that they are all the *Presbyterians*, and that there are no *Presbyterians*, or no Body of Men under that Designation, who are not, in the things now under debate, of their way, which I hope he shall never evince. That I owned, they are Godly Men, is sophistically alleged: I doubt not but there are such among them; tho' I never thought what they differ in from the rest of the *Presbyterians* to be any part of their Godliness. But I never called them (yea nor any other party of Men) universally Godly, nor thought that all was well done, that is committed among a Body of Men where are many Godly: Yea nor that whatever is done by good Men is Good: Christs Disciples were good Men, yet their forsaking him and flying, was no Good Action. It is probable enough that some bad Men might creep in among these zealots, and might much influence these Disorders as the *mixt multitude* influenced the *Israelites* to Murmuring in the Wilderness.

§. 5. But he will prove the *Cameronians* to be *Presbyterians*: A Conclusion which (in the sense given me deny not) let us hear his Arguments. 1. *If they be not Presbyterians, to what Communion then do they*

they belong? A: This is all we should allege that the *Arminians* in the Church of England are the *Episcopal* Party; and ask them who deny it. To what *Communion* do they belong? Surely neither to the *Presbyterian* nor *Independent*, &c. Wherefore I answer directly, tho' in most things they agree with the *Presbyterians*, yet in other things they are a *Communion* by themselves: And indeed till the Lord was pleased to abate the heat of that division that was among us, they had cast off *Communion* with the *Presbyterian Church*, and would bear none of her Ministers, but cleave to two or three of their own way. His second Argument is, have they any Principles, Discipline, or Government, different from the *Presbyterian Church*? A: For Discipline and Government, the *Arminians* of England have none different from the *Episcopal Church*, and yet the *Apologists* and others might justly blame us if we should not distinguish between *Arminians* and *Episcopalians*. For Principles, they had principles both with Respect to the Civil Government, and as to that Submission that is due to Church Governments, which other *Presbyterians* did never hold. And tho' this had not been, and if they had been Members of our Congregations, our Dislike of the practice, and having no accusation to it, both clear us from the blame of it, and all that can be inferred against us is, that some *Presbyterians* have done ill things. And it be can instance in any party of Men, of whom the like cannot be said, we shall yield to his Argument. I hope he will not allege it of his own party. His third Argument is, were not these men lately owned and received by the pretended General Assembly, without renouncing any Articles of Doctrine, or disavowing any of their practices that they so zealously recommended to their followers, in the West, &c. (to say nothing of his Discretion in the Bishop that he bestowed on the Assembly, which the King and Parliament indicted and condemned, as well as for as the representative of the Church of Scotland) It is true the three Ministers who had headed that party, were received upon promise of Submission to the Church, and orderly behaviour; which they have since faithfully performed, and by that means multitudes of the People that followed them are brought to more sober Counters, and do wait on the ordinances of God (dispensed by the *Presbyterian* Ministers, which before they could not be persuaded to. And was it not wisdom in the Assembly to settle these Divisions by lenity, rather than to exasperate, and condemn them, by putting men on formal retractation of what was done, seeing the same thing was materially performed. Will any man (who is not fond of picking Quarrels) say, that by this Course the Assembly approved of what these men have done, or that all the *Presbyterians* are of the same sentiments that these men had been of; especially considering that the *Presbyterian Church* hath received into Ministerial Communion, and admitted to a share of the Government of the Church, several of them who had complied with *Episcopacy* (and are ready to do the same by all good and useful men among them who will not endeavour the hurt of the sealed Government) without putting them to express retracting of their former principles or practices, this considered, I hope the Reader will see, so how little purpose his *Sinister* brought from the imagined Apology of the several parties among the *Downs*; for if one only of these parties he mentioneth were guilty of these Irregularities he speaketh out here is no reason to blame the other sections in those things, whatever blame might be fixed on them within the things wherein they agreed.

§. 6. What he saith in page 3. *It has the most intelligent among them (the Presbyterians) did contrive and manage the irregularities and notions of their own party.* (I suppose he means the *Camerons*) This he deny, and shall consider the proofs of this assertion in its place. But before he cometh to this, he pretendeth to oppose the vanity of his Apology more closely: How he performeth what he promiseth in his *bi*; let us now hear he saith, that the know no Opinions that Mr. Cameron propagated which were peculiar to himself. He follows most closely, and ingenuously the Hypotheses of the old and zealous *Presbyterians*. We know that he and they who joined with him, and they who succeeded to him held that they owed no allegiance to the King, because he had broken the Covenant: That they might not lawfully bear any of the Ministers of Scotland, because either they had received Indulgence from the King, or owned such Ministers who had received it, nor did not declare against them.

Were

Were these the Hypotheses of the Old and zealous *Presbyterians*? But whatever were his principles, his practice in making so wide a separation from all the other *Presbyterian* Ministers in Scotland is a sufficient Apology for their Innocency, who neither were of his way, nor had any hand in the Disorders that we now debate about, which were committed by that party which he had headed, while he was alive. Another effort of his more close arguing is, 'Mr. Cameron was not a proper Man to be the founder of a new Sect.' As if profound Learning, and deep policy, were always necessary to mislead a few of the less intelligent People, especially when the severity of persecution had imbecillated their Minds, both against the Rulers, and the *Episcopal* Church; it was easy to let them off from them: And from all that did not make the same Relentments with them, of what was then acted. I am yet unable to find out his close Reasoning, for what followeth is, 'That the *Episcopal* party first called that party *Cameronians*, and by that name mean all *Presbyterians* whose zeal for their Faction over-drives them beyond all Discretion: and this all along be impertinent to all *Presbyterians*, and therefore he will allow no difference among *Presbyterians*; some will call this a loose Declaration rather than close Argumentation, for whatever names he is pleased to give to persons, or things, they who know any thing of our affairs do know, that all *Presbyterians* did not join with, nor allow the courses of Mr. Cameron, and his followers: It is of the same Stamp that cometh next, viz. That the *Cameronians* had better studied their Principles, and drawn more natural Conclusions from them than others: This is barely and falsely asserted. Also that 'the *Cameronians* did assert their principles when others were silent: This is also false, others did always, as they had opportunity, assert their Principles tho' not the same way that they were asserted by the *Cameronians*, this was done both in Field Meetings, and in other Meetings, such as then could be had. Tho' I confess the *Presbyterians* made it more their Business to inculcate upon Peoples minds the great truths of the Gospel, on which our Salvation dependeth, than what belongeth to Church Government.

§ 7. What further goeth with this Author, for his 'close Reasoning is, to shew that what the *Cameronians* did was according to *Presbyterian* Principles: All that I can find for proof of this most absurd assertion, is that the people may (with their Pastors) Reform the Church 'when the Magistrate is slack, or opposit to the designed Reformation, and the *Presbyterians* ho'd *Presbytry* to be 'Juris Divini, and the removal of the *Episcopal* Clergy was necessary for this Reformation. If he condemn all popular Reformations of the Church (as he here seemeth to do) he will not approve of many Reformations, either from Heathenism, or from Popery. But I will not digress to demonstrate this, the soundness of this principle rightly understood is made evident by the Learned *Claude*, *Historic. Defence of the Reformation* P. 7 &c. So that it is not to be looked on as a principle peculiar to *Scotch Presbyterians*. The principle that they hold is, that every Man in his station, should endeavour the Reformation of the Church: that people may believe the Truth, and Worship God according to his institution, whether the Magistrat allow it or not: But if he will prove that the *Presbyterian* Church did ever determine, that private persons, or Ministers, may, by force of Arms, carry on this Reformation, then shall we own the *Rablings* that he is pleading against: And unless he can make this appear, all his talk is beside the purpose. He hold'y, but most falsely, asserteth in the end of P. 4. and P. 5, that the *Rable* had the best directions that could be had: And had exact Intelligence, by their Agents, what they might venture on. This was in the Pamphlets formerly related, asserted with the same confidence, and was denied in the *second Vindication* and is still denied: But it is below this high pretender to *close Reasoning*, to take notice of that: or to bring any shadow of proof for it: But this, 'the *Rablings* was not acted by the Parishioners of these Ministers who were *Rabled*; Ergo, it was done by venture of a League and Covenant among 'the *Presbyterians* in general, or the chief Men of them. The meanest in our Universities would be ashamed of such Logick; could not a few who had separated from the *Presbyterians*, as well as from the *Episcopalians*, manage such an affair as this, without advice from Men of note, either in the state, or in the Church? however this Authors flattered fancy doth represent the *Rabling* to him, we see nothing in it which looketh like a Combination of the whole Society, (viz. *Presbyterians*) but rather, like the efforts of Passion, and Revenge: Or at least, an undiscrēt zeal of a few Persons.

That *some of the Gentrie of the West*, were scared from opposing these Rabblings, is like his other Arguments to prove a Combination of *Presbyterians* in this matter: Men of less understanding than this Author pretendeth to, may conjecture other Reasons for their forbearance, they saw the interest they had fallen in with sinking, and they had no heart to appear for it, either by defending their Ministers who had led them upon the Ice, or by being active in the Elections for the Convocation for settling the Nation, that then was in a Convulsion; but were glad to Lurk. His Charitable assertions of the *Presbyterians*, (without exception or limitation) I shall not endeavour to refuse; pitying the Author who thus doth expose his Temper while he crieth out against others for their want of *that Spirit* that becometh the Gospel: They are, that they never forgive any Injury, and they never say the Lords Prayer, because it is so opposite to their Nature: It is impossible to oblige them by favours, that the People of the West are generally Cunning, and Dissembling beyond measure. Of these and many such like Assertions sprinkled, as the Flowers of Rhetorick, throughout his Book, I shall only use his own words (*mutato nomine de se* &c. p. 27 that such Assertions *carrie with them all the marks by which a wilful and deliberate lie may be known from modest and ingenious truth*, or our Author had Cause to scissie of the truth or falshood of these things. Let it also be considered, how agreeable these imputations are to that *hating and Gospel Spirit* that he elsewhere talketh of.

§ 8. After he hath reasoner without farther (that is without any) proof, that the *Maxims of our Moral Theologie do allow the greatest Villanies acted on the Clergy*; he bringeth another Argument of the Rabblings being concerted by the Party, viz. *Presbyterians*: That *some Presbyterians then at London contradicted the Reports that were sent thither concerning them* As well they might deny many of them, tho I do not hear any denied all of them: He might know, that many of these stories which are printed, are not only denied, but disproved: And it is not like that the reports sent to London, were more universally true. What is Argumentative in his Paper, I am willing to consider; but am not concerned to answer what filleth up page sixth, and seventh, which is asserting the 5th, 6th, and 7th time, that *what was done by these Rabbles was concerted by the Presbyterians*. One good Argument would have convinced us more than such bold and repeated Affirmations. That the *Presbyterian States-men* (and the Church and People also in their wilkes) *preferred Presbtery to union with England* is not to be wondered at by any, but them who think more of their civil Interests, than of what concerneth Religion. His out-cries against the Covenant and the Transactions of that time I do not regard, what was said more distinctly to that purpose in the *Ten questions* is answered, and he is not pleased to take farther notice of it, then to declaim in the same strain of obloquie. His Marginal note, p. 7. Insinuating that *Presbyterians* do preach against the use of the Lords Prayer, is Injurious: I have heard many in Sermons asserting the Lawfulness of using it, tho at the same time they deny the necessity of using it, or that it is commanded to use these words: But I never heard any Preach against the use of it.

§ 9. He bringeth p. 8. an instance of a *Presbyterian Rabble Misrepresented by the Vindicator*, in which he insulteth, as if he had at one blow, not only routed the poor *Vindicator*, but the whole *Presbyterian* Party (his big words are enough to fright an unwary Reader) that the *Vindicator* doth by this passage 'Flie in the Face of all Evidence, and contradict the Conviction of all the Inhabitants at Edinburgh: And a little below, from this one single instance his Book is ruined, and his Authority bas'd, &c. And betelleth us of his Antagonist's *slighting and confounding two very different Stories* intow, viz. *The tumultuous defacing of the Kings Chappel, and the burning of the Pope in Effigy*. The former he says, *was a horrible Tumult, the latter an orderly Action*. Let us now examine the ground of this his Triumph, he citeth the words of the 24. *Vindic.* p. 35. *Edinburgh Edition*, For the Tumults at Edinburgh; *we know of none, but what was made by the Students of the Colledge, there, in burning the Pope in Effigy*. But our Apologist is pleased to leave out the words that immediately follow, viz. *And defacing the Chappel of Holy-Rood House*. Where is now this *slighting and confounding of two distinct stories*? are they not both expressly mentioned? and the one distinguished from the other. I hardly think this Author could be so unwise or dishonest as of purpose to omit so

material a part of this passage; which he knew every Reader would observe, and discover the Cheat; but rather judge that the *Indecency* of his *Passion* with which he writ the whole Book (or some other present disorder) might make him overlook the half of the sentence: Some may be apt to think, that such a slip may more effectually rubbe his whole Book, and baffle his *saniborists*, than what he now charges on the *Indecency*. Or may be, as he wrote his Book without the aid of other Books (which he often than once will brag on us) for he had not the Book by him which he pretendeth to refute, but had once read it over with *Indecency* passion, and that same tempest of mind prompted him to so many huffing and angry words, that considering whether they would reflect thame on himself, or on his *Antagonist*. For the *Burning* of the *Cope*, he denieth to be a Tumult and so we are not concerned about it: But I observe he giveth account but of one attempt of the kind; another long before this, was quite different, as I learn from them who were then in *Edinburgh* (I was then at a great distance from it) he saith that a great many of the Nobility and Gentry were looking on, it was done at the *Cross*; the students marched in Rank with the Colledge Mace before them, which could not be done without the Masters permission. This was the last: for the former, I am told, that when it was known to be designed, and the place intended for it to be the *Cross* which (the ordinary place of Execution of Malefactors) a party of Soldiers under the command of General *Dalryll* intrenched in all baist shieth; which the Boyes understanding, they went to a far distant place off the Town, and did their work at the head of *Black Frier Wind*: That they had the Colledge Mace carried before them. I do not find: that the Masters did permit it, is neither true, nor probable for the Principal (who may be is not unknown to this Author) did most furiously rebuke and threaten one of the chief Actors in that scene; and how consistent is it to allow his Holiness to be thus affronted, and yet shew such zeal against destroying the Monuments and gentilities of Idolatry, in the *Popish Chapell*, as this Author doth for the Tumult at *Holy Rood House*. To make the matter odious we cometh a very incoherent story, that the *Presbyterians* intending it, gave out that the *Popish* intended a Massacre of the *Presbyterians*: and the *Presbyterians* flew to Arms; and for their night in the City were the marks of Hell and Confusion, nothing being heard but Screeds, &c. and all this was managed by some of the leading *Presbyterians*. The true History is, a Company of the Students of the Colledge (for they were the first even in the tumult at *Holy Rood House*, which he holds so much aggravate) together with a Rable of Apprentices, and others of the Populace, met together, near to the *Abby Gate*; on what design we know not, but by guels; and may be themselves knew not, as it was with the Rable mentioned, *128*. 19. 32. (For *Rabbling*, if Antiquity were as good an argument for Church Government as our Lawyers would have it to be, might vie with *Episcopacy*) as they approached to the Gate, the Guard, commanded by Mr. *Wallace*, drew out against them, they having no Arms (a good Argument that the business was not concerted by men of any common understanding) would not remove from before the Gate: Upon which some of the Guard fired among them, and killed some on the place and wounded others; who all died of their Wounds except one: Which made many think that all the Bullets were some way Poisonous: Upon this, notice was given to some of the Statesmen, to the Council met, and sent a Mace to *Wallace*, commanding him to surrender: that post he was in, designing to put another Guard in the place of that, which might not provoke the Rable, nor favour the *Popish* interest: This Message he refused: And then Soldiers were sent by Authority, to force him from it which was easily effected; his courage being more against unarmed Boyes, than armed men. While the Soldiers were thus employed, the Rable broke in to the *Abby*, and defaced the *Popish* Chapple, and destroyed what they met with that was fit for the *Popish* Worship: they also defaced the *Popish* Colledge, and what belonged to it; it having been lately erected in defiance of the Law.

So. Let us now a little examine the account of this matter, given by the *Apologists*, 1st. That the *Presbyterians* intended to make the most murderous and most Terrible show that they were able to make: Is false; because the Actors of this Tragedie were a mixed multitude: whereof the few who had any Inclination toward *Presbytrian*, and hardly any of them had formed principles about them

proverſie, being a Company of Boyes, alſo becauſe the *Presbyterians* could have made a ſhew of 20 armed men for every ſingle unarmed Boy was there. And likewiſe becauſe there was no concern about this matter, of which more anon. 2. The Apprehenſion of a Maſſacre, that he ſakeſh of blood in his own head, or in the Fancy of ſome of his ſort. I do not find that there was any Talk of it. And it is moſt improbable, that it ſhould be from *Papiſts*, who (as himſelf obſerveth) were wholly out of Capacity. Theſe *Presbyterians* had feared ſuch miſchief from the *Jacobites* and high Church-men, then toraged by the Change, (and which I find not that any did apprehend). It was ſtrange, that they ſhould raiſe a Rabble of ſuch as were the likeliſt to be the Executioners of what they feared. Alſo, it were the way to excite men to make a Maſſacre, as alſo to give ſome colour for Juſtifying it, thus to aſſault them who were living in peace. 3. That there was a Night ſpent in ſuch confuſions, or that there were ſuch Screeching, and Terror in the City, on this occaſion, I cannot find by the beſt Informations. Only ſuch a fancy is Subſervient to our Authors deſign; and it ſeems he can ſerve himſelf with truth or untruth, as need requirerh. 4. That a report was ſpread that ſome were Killed, who were not; Killed, is not denied, but that this Report was the contrivance of the *Presbyterians* to animate the People to riſe on the King's Houſe, is one of the groſſeſt of Falſhoods: And that few of the Students of the Collidge were there is not true. 5. That this Tumult was concerted by the *Presbyterians*, he endeavourerh to prove, becauſe the Maſter of F. and ſeveral others whole Names he ſheweth ſit in conceal, were preſent. I know that many Men of good Note did appear, after the killing of the Boyes, and that by Authority Wallace was ordered to remove with his Guard. The acting of theſe Men was not concurring with the Rabble, the one acted without Authority, the other with it; but that any ſuch Perſons either appeared with the Rabble, and without Command from Superior Powers, or had any hand in deſacing any part of the Abbey, he ſhall never be able to prove. Al becauſe either by confeſſion of Party, or any probable Evidence, make it appear that G. S. or Mr. M. were the Contrivers of this Tumult, or that they glory in it (as he would have us believe) he ſhall have the better in this particular; but if there be no Truth in this (as indeed there is not), then the Reader may know who beſt deſerveth to be thus branded, that the ſpirits of Lies and Fancie runneth through his Book. The Plea of an Advocate at the Tryal of Mr. Wallace is a ridiculous Argument to prove what it is, brought for, every Body knoweth, that in their Pleadings, they conſider only what may make for the Cauſe which they are Patrons of. He (unwiſely and omipouſly) maketh this Eſſay at Edinburgh but, he preſaies to what they intended to the Clergy in that place. As inſinuating that the *Papiſt* Clergy whom the Rabble had ſpoiled of their Superſtitious Tokens, and the *Episcopal* Clergy of Edinburgh, were to be conſidered alike; were managing the ſame deſigns, and had the ſame Friends and Foes. If the Miniſters at the Trone Church thanked God for a glorious Reformation; he had many other Cauſes for ſo doing then this Rabbling; and it is evil ſuſpecting, to aſcribe ſuch a ſenſe to his words, unleſs he had either named the Rabbling, or by Circumlocution particularized it.

¶ 11. He maketh p. 20. the *Vindicator* next Plea to be that there was an *interregnum* when theſe things were acted: It had been ſome Candor, if he had pleaſed to tell his Reader to what end, and how far, this Plea was uſed. It was never brought to juſtifie what was done by the Rabble: But on the contrary, it is expreſſly ſaid 2d. *Vindie*. p. 26. (where that Plea is mentioned) that what they did was not allowable: but that it was not ſo, he wondererh at, conſidering what provocations the People had by their former Sufferings; and ſome manner of Legal Redreſs. How impertinent then are his Reaſonings againſt this Plea, that theſe Men were not looſed from the Law of God, which ſhould have reſtrained them. Did his Antagoniſt ever ſay ſo, or did he uſe words to that effect? And that he is pleaſed to impute theſe Rabblings to Saints and to Gaily and Zealous *Presbyterians*, is no ſign of that regard to Truth that is fit, nor of that reſpect to ſerious Religion, which might be expected from every Chriſtian, much more from a Miniſter, and Doctor of Divinity. The People being injured and provoked by the Clergy he bringeth as another Plea, uſed by the *Vindicator*: And the ſame is to be obſerved concerning it, which is ſaid of the former Plea, it was never uſed to juſtifie the Actions of theſe

these disorders: We think they must have committed their Offs to him who judges *discreetly*; and that in the use of Orderly and Legal means, for redressing their Grievances. Under this Head our *Apologist* makes a plain denial of matter of Fact: He knoweth not what the Clergy did in the staff (though all *well* and know that many of them did severely persecute their People, and did stir up the Magistrate to ruin them) But he never knew one that prosecuted the Dissenters without *good reason*; but many that did them kindnesses. Others can tell of some in the City where he lived, who debated Meetings, and them who came not to Church with great forwardness and zeal, and multitudes of Instances in most parts of the Country, of their persecutions against Dissenters in *Prize*: That to deny it, deserves other words than I list to use; even such as himself liberally bestoweth on them who affirm what I likest him. We never did Chargeall with this practice, nor did ever deny but that some of them did the kindness to Dissenters.

§. 12. Next he defendeth the Clergies prosecuting Dissenters according to Law p. 11. and that with a *Right* pretensing to some what of Argument, but cloasted in words becoming this Authors Genius, and of some other Pamphletiers of the Party: But of which I am sure *Episcopal* Men will be ashamed: Such as *Dark* and *Enthusiastick* Principles, we are of *infidelity* and *idolatry*: *Boute-fuses* and *Intendieries* who were to be killed with greater severity: Speaking evil of *Dignities* took place of the ten Commandments, &c. His first Argument for the persecution by the Clergy is, The Peace of the Nation endangered; the Government, by frequent *Shakings*, is brought to relapse into a *Civil War*, &c. If this Argument have any force it is only for the Clergies discovering *Factious* had risen in Arms, or were acting, or conspiring what was of that tendency. But many of our Clergy were instrumental to persecution, long before there had been any Insurrection, and before they were Injoynd to debate the People to the Circuit Courts: And they did very many who never had hand in any of these Risings against the King. And indeed it was the insufferable Opposition the People suffered, which caused these Tumults and Troubles which might seem to make the Government; wherefore, here is *non causa pro causa*. Another Argument is, the Souls of People are poisoned with *dark* and *Enthusiastick* Principles. I wish he had named them: It is true, some wild Principles were taught by some, who perpetrated themselves from the generality of the *Presbyterians*, as well as from the *Episcopal* Church: But with what Brow can he impute this to *Presbyterian*, without exception, and set the Dogs on them all to worry them; because of these mens Principles. And will he dare to say, that none were persecuted but they who taught these wild Principles? Wherefore it was not Zeal for the Peoples Souls, but a Spirit of Persecution, which prompted them to this Gondall. Yes, I have known, where Minister and People daily went to hear the Parish Minister; only after both Sermons the Minister used to exercise in his own Family, and some Neighbours came to join with the Family, and for this he was persecuted; while they could charge him with no thing else, in Doctrine, or in Practice. His 3d. Argument is, they made *Schisms*, and therefore they must be persecuted. Who made the Schism, I have made elsewhere appear: And shall now only deny that the *Presbyterians* made it: They were forced to it. When he shall bring Arguments for his Assertion, they shall be considered. Again, Must all be persecuted to extirpation who divide from the Regal Church, because their Conscience will not allow them to join with it, while they otherwise live peaceably? For *Boute-fuses* and *Intendieries*, who labour to stir Sedition in the State, or do unpeaceably dissent from the Church, we plead for no Toleration to them? But were none else persecuted? Yes, I could make it appear in many Instances that several of the most peaceable Dissenters suffered most Obloquy, and much Persecution. What he saith out of the Learned *Baker*, is no more than that *Episcopacy* is Tolerable; which was the good Mans Opinion: But our Author concealeth, that he at length pleads for *Presbytery*, as more ancient than *Episcopacy*; and to be preferred to it; and that he blameth *Episcopal* Usurpation, as intolerable, against which to contend was our Offs. Yes, he saith, p. 35. *Adi. Francisci: Minus tolerantis opus est* (speaking of the Differences between *Presbyterians* and *Episcopals*;) Then certainly they who could not comply with *Episcopacy*, and so (in our Authors Dialect) made a *Schism*, are not to be persecuted with that severity that he speaketh for,

§ 43. Another of his Arguments for this persecution by the Clergy is, *That these of the Clergy who were persecuted, were kindly used at the Revolution.* A. If any made no distinction in this matter, but served all alike, we do not defend, but blame that Conduct: And I deny not but some of them who earned on the *Whiggish* work, considered all alike: But I am sure that was not approved, nor practised by the Generality of Presbyterians, nor by the Presbyterian Church. I must not his repetitions, p. 11. Subjoin, he allegeth, that the Clergy, as well as the Laity, were obliged to *crash* and *murder* in the beginnings of Rebellion, and the attempts of such as preached the most pernicious principles. This is above answered: These were cruel executions when none of these things appeared, and against such as were never chargeable with any of these. This Author all along taketh a *few* Cameronians for the Body of the Presbyterians: And on this Foundation buildeth all his Batteries against us. He saith p. 12. That the Ministers at the Restoration of K. C. Suffered no more than to be turned out, for not obeying the Law, in taking a presentation and Episcopal Collation, and that Bishop Lightfoot made such offers of accommodation, as none could refuse but fallen and desperate incendiaries, for nothing being required of them but what the most *Rigid* Presbyterians might comply with, if their goal in supporting their action had not informed them, as much against the vow of *Deposition*, as against the peace and safety of their Country. There are the modest words that this Author assests, while he talketh so much against others for want of the meek spirit of the Gospel: It is false that Ministers suffered no more than turning out, for even that is aggravated now (when it toucheth his party) with hideous outcries of an unparalleled persecution. How many of them were imprisoned, banished, inter-communed &c. The offers that B. Lightfoot made, did show him to be a moderate B. and a man of strictly Gospel Temper, far from that of his Brethren: yet even his offers could not be accepted by Presbyterians, with a good Conscience: For none could preach in his Diocess without owning, at least in practice, his Episcopal Authority, by joining with the *Presbyrie*, and Synod where he presided as *Bishop*, and by taking his warrant to the *Presbyrie* to admit such a one to preach in such a place. *Ex parte* &c.

§ 44. There follows a further evidence of this Gentleman's veracity, Candor, and Meekness: He writeth in Scotland (saith he) are generally blinded with this fatal prejudice, *an invincible* inflexible *Enthusiasm*, they think that no man can *stand* *against* the Presbyterians, but for: *Immediately* *against* the light of his own Conscience: and a great deal more to that purpose. Every assertion is not only false but manifestly so, to all who have ever conversed with us, and who is not fatally blinded with other prejudices. Tho we be far from judging the Consciences of them who differ: And are convinced, and do on all occasions, declare, that we think many of the Episcopal Clergy, and People, are Conscientiously of *his* opinion; yet, and that some who have *debated* against us, *though* that they did God service, as Saul and other Persecutors have done before. Yet is it necessary to have the same thoughts of this Author (and the rest that write and speak in this strain) considering that he hath lived among Presbyterians, and cannot but know that these are the acknowledgments of all of them, not of the most part. Yes, I doubt that any one, even of the most ignorant or most Zealous of them, did ever speak at this Rate: His Declaration, p. 13. (For in this way of writing his talent seemeth to lie, rather than in solid reasoning, which may move an ignorant Reader, but never satisfy one that is intelligent,) against the Actions of the Presbyterians in K. C. The first time, is sufficiently answered, *Vind. 1. q. 3.* Wherefore I shall not trouble the Reader with that debate, seeing there is here nothing new, except bitter words, and false imputations that Ministers did, and do, endeavour to ruin their Neighbours (farther than by the exercise of Discipline to purge the Church of unqualified Ministers) that they used *Exigues* to punish the *severals* of *offences*, that the Ministers said their Cause was like to prosper when they justified the *crimes* by the *commissions* of *another*: Or that ever they did justify the Crimes. That they value *Sovereignty* above all others, that it is the *idol* they bow to, &c. These I say are a heap of notorious falsehoods, boldly asserted, but not attempted to be proved: But the most tender is this: *Some* of these assertions

are disproved (having been brought by his associates) in the Book that he refuseth, but this he has no mind to consider. The *Presbyterians* must be the worst of men; that he is resolved on, *par passum*.

S. 15. In the end of p. 13. He (the *Reviewer*) insinuates all along his Book, that most part of the Clergy were wicked men. It had been fair dealing in the *Apologist* to have mentioned some one place or other where this was insinuated, Supposed or asserted: I know no such place. It is like he said so of many of them, but if ever he said so they were generally so, or did proportion the numbers of them to those who were of a good Conversation, (which he never did) in that case he will be *peccavi*. For he professeth that he doth not think it is so. Some of them have been charged with Crimes and these Crimes proved against them, and they censured accordingly: And more of that kind shall be proved when ever he pleaseth. Tho I am far from thinking all is true that is said of them more than that all is true that he and his friend who wrote the *Presbyterian Plea* have written of the *Presbyterians*; I think, what men write they should be able to give evidence for it. But we are not obliged to prove what is the talk of the Town, of any Person. He saith who made them the *Presbyterians* Judges of the Scandalous Clergy. A. 1. Christ hath made his Church Judge of them. And we are able to make it appear that the *Presbyterian* Ministers and Elders are the Church of Scotland Representatives. 2. The Law setting *Presbyterian* Government, hath given its sanction to that judicative Authority that they have from Christ. I approve, of what he saith, p. 14. That the *Scandalous Ministers* are rather to be lamented than insulted over. Yet it does not hinder but that the scandal may be mentioned when a reason is given of the Peoples Aversion from them; or may be charged on them, tried, and censured, by these in Authority. If any be glad (as he saith) when they can discover the tripping of their *Adversaries*: We look on him as not a Christian Temper, which rejoiceth not in iniquity, but *rejoiceth in the truth*: I do solemnly profess (and I hope none of my Brethren will say, otherwise) that I wish they all were holy and good men. If any ever looked on the Immoralities of the Clergy as a sufficient Argument against *Episcopacy*, and that it should therefore be overturned, tho (as he supposeth) it had continued since the days of the *Apostles*: I conclude such a Person to be no good Logician; yet I cannot then so averre, that if it can be proved that there are other good grounds for laying it aside, and withal, it do appear, that Immoralities have much flourished under its wings, among the People and among the Clergy, this is a good commulative Argument for its abolishment. If any of the *Presbyterians* have gathered stones against the Clergy, which they could not prove; let them bear their Blame: We dislike such practices, as much as he doth. All who have been libelled, have either had their Crimes proved, or they have been acquitted, which is a sufficient vindication of the Church; and a clearing of them who were so libelled; and where any by mistake have been Censured by *Presbyters*, without sufficient ground (the instances of which are very few) as the Church took care to prevent it, so she hath done to redress any grievance of this kind that was complained of. We know the People in the North were more pleased with *Episcopal* Ministers, then they in the West were, but not that, but the Commission of the General Assembly being hindered to sit in the North, was the cause why scandalous Ministers there were not tried and censured. The *Apologist* had more consulted his own credit as a Christian, if he had forbore such unmannerly mocking at serious Religion, as to insinuate that we look on *insulting as necessary to make a good saint*, what a temper of mind this passage, with many others in his Book, doth signify, I am not willing to name; but rather to lament it, and wish that he may be convinced of the evil of it. What he mentioneth of *Reveries*, we shall not decline, provide they will affirm nothing but truth, and what they can make appear, by rational evidence. And if they will delate, and prove what Scandals they can find among us, that they may be censured, we shall reckon it a good Work, but this is far from that Authors conduct, while he is expressly condemning imputing Scandals to the Clergy, as a *scandalous way of writing*, yet with the same breath, he saith *insulting* being allowable he could tell that many of the *Presbyterian* Ministers were very Scandalous (some them *Adulterers*, some *Fornicators*, some *Blasphemers*, some whole *Presbyterian* Families *Immoral*

Here is little either Wit, or Honesty, or of that good Nature, that he chargeth his Antagonist with the want of. What Wisdom is it to say that we question the allowableness of an Act, when we are resolutely, and deliberately, and openly doing it? Is he not charging some *Presbyterian* Ministers with the horridlest of Crimes, and that in the basest manner without giving occasion to the Church to try them, or them to vindicate themselves, their Names being concealed: he can neither vindicate his Honesty, nor good Nature in this matter, unless he name the Persons, and prove the things, and when he has done that, if they be not duly censured, let him reproach us at his pleasure. If I knew any such Persons among the *Presbyterians*, I should have little peace in concealing their Faults. If he (which he asserteth) *know not five of the Clergy of Scotland, who could not undergo the severest Examinations*: I hope he will not blame others because their knowledge is more extensive than his. Many more have been orderly convicted of Immoralities, and more are notoriously of a bad Conversation: But I dislike this subject, as much as he pretendeth to do, and therefore leave it. We do not envy or derogate from any good that any of them have done, or designed to do; nor his Joy and Gloriation that he speaketh of in his Suffering: Only I cannot well reconcile this strain, with the rest of his Book. I am sure if I should be guilty of so many false Imputations, and bitter Speeches, and Reflections against any body of *Protestants*, as he venteth against the *Presbyterians* (without discrimination) I should have little Peace or Joy.

§. 16. Our Author bringeth us another Topick used to vindicate the *Presbyterians*: That the *Clergy* pressed the Consciences of the *Presbyterians*, and that the People could not own them as their Ministers, because they were obtruded on them, and not invited by Popular Elections: And for this he citeth p. 52. and 57. In neither of which places there is one word to that purpose: I have taken some pains to find that passage (for I believe it is some where in that Book, tho' may be not to the purpose that it is here brought for) but cannot find it: Not being at leisure to read every Line of the Book for the sake of this Citation. What I hold in this matter is, That it is the Peoples right to chuse their Pastors; and it is a grievance to have a Pastor set over them by the *Bishop* or *Patron*, without their Consent: And that tho' it is their Wisdom, to consent a *post facto*, if the man be qualified; yet till they consent explicitly, or implicitly, they are under no tie to own that Man as their Minister: However they may lawfully receive the Ordinances from him. Let us now hear what our *Apologist* hath to say on this Head. He first bringeth some arguments *ad hominem*: As that *Popular Elections* could not be had for a *Presbyterian* in the North. A. This is not universally true: But where it is so, the Church will not obtrude a Pastor on that Flock, unless they neglect to chuse a person whom the *Presbytry*, on tryal, may find to be qualified; and this neglect continueth for the time appointed by the Law: And then the Election in all reason, as well as by the Law of the Nation, devolveth into the hands of the *Presbytry*. And when the *Presbytry* hath set a Man so over a People, such of them as will not own him as their Minister, I see not how he is obliged to own them as his Flock, further than to do what he can to persuade them to good and to restrain them from Sin. Next he tells us of many *Remonstrances* conducted by *Cromwell's Troopers*. A. I never thought that a Pastoral Relation could be founded on such induction; where no consent of the People was, either antecedent, or consequent to it. He 3dly. mentioneth, That the same was done in the old Colledge of Aberdeen without regular and Collegiate Election, and without Tryal or Examination. A. It is a wise Argument from a Colledge to a Church: The Affairs of the one are to be regulated by the Laws of the Nation; the other by the Institution of Christ. In that Colledge by a Visitation, in a Legal and Orderly way, the Principal and Sub-Principal, and two of the Regents were deposed: To supply the two Regents places, all who would offer themselves were invited by a Program to dispute; six or seven appeared; after several days disputation, two of them were chosen (as having fairly won these places) by the Masters of the Colledge, with some who were by Publick Authority to assist them. The Principal and Sub-Principal did notwithstanding Officiate till two years after, by the Authority of *Oliver Cromwell* (who then was owned as having the Supreme Authority *de facto*) A Visitation was appointed; and these two Places were found Vacant, and a Minister of *Aberdeen* was put into the Principal's place; and one of the two Regents

who had entered as above said, and had taught Philosophy two years, was made Sub-Principal: What is there in all this that can be blamed, further than that it was the general Calamity of the Nation to be under a Foreign Power, by whom all the places of the Nation were then disposed of. I know our Author would not have so impertinently digressed, but that he would have a sting at a Person for whom he seemeth to have no kindness, and whose having a Room in a Colledge is an Eye-sore to him.

§ 17. Now the Author will *no more trifle* (as hitherto he hath indeed done) let us then hear his solid and serious Reasons. He giveth a long account of the way of Admission in the *Episcopal Church*, against which I could object several things; but I shall only take notice of what is to our present purpose, viz. That *an Edict is served, and the People allowed to object against the Candidate*, whom the Patron hath chosen for them. Even this is lost to be done that it were as good it were not done; as when Mr. *McKenzie's* Edict to be Minister at *Kirkcaldiss* was served at *St. Andrews*, about twenty six Miles distant. But supposing it were always duly managed, it doth not sufficiently answer the right that the People have to chuse their own Pastors. His Argument from disorders happening upon popular Election is fully answered, *Rational defense of Nonconform, Part 3. §. 6. p. 207, 208.* But it is like the Apologist cannot read such Books as that without the *Indecency of Passion*. Tho' he is pleased to bring a passage out of it, when he fancieth he can exposte the Author by it. It is his way, here and elsewhere, to assert strongly, the conclusion, without taking notice of Reasons against it. That this, as all Christs Institutions, managed by sinful Men, may be abused, we deny not. Hath not Prelatical Power often degenerated into Tyranny; and yet I suppose he would not have it abrogated. It is denied (which he saith cannot be denied), *That the methods of Election differed, often in divers Ages and Countries, since the first Plantation of Christianity*: Unless he understand this of the more degenerate Ages of the Church, after the eighth Century: Before that, it was uniform and constant, viz. It was done *a clero & populo*, as it is abundantly proved in the Book cited, p. 201. &c. It is also false, *That no Christian Church came nearer the Apostolick Method than the Church of Scotland, under the Episcopal Constitution*. For it is evident that in the Apostolick, and Primitive Church, there was no Election made by a Patron. The Act of the *General Assembly*, depriving a disaffected Parish of the Power of Election, maketh nothing for his design. For it is without question, that Peoples Rights and Church Privileges, may for some Causes, be Suspended, by Authority of the Church: His account of the Election of *Leith* is most false. Mr. *Gray* had not one of the Legal Eldership for him, nor the Magistrates of *Leith*, who represent the Hesitors; and a great body of the People did oppose him; with what Brow then, can our Author say, *That this Election was unanimous*. For *Musleburgh* and *Tranent*, none hath, to this day, been Elected in a Legal way, that is, by the Hesitors and Elders. That Patronages were not taken away in *Scotland* till 1649; provech no more, then that *Presbyterians* think it not unlawful to own a Man who is not antecedently Elected by the People; and this was never denied by us: Only it was pleaded, that when the People had other objections against a Minister, this might fortify their aversion from him, that he had not entered in a due way. *Presbyterians* did always think Elections by Patrons to be a great Grievance: Yet they bare it; till it could be removed by Law. The reason of his following discourse I cannot comprehend, viz. How it should come to pass that *so many Artifices are needed to promote a Clergy Man, if Popular Election take place: And that it is otherwise, where the Patron chuseth*. Nothing is more evidently false, then are both parts of this Assertion. For our way is, when a Parish is Vacant, the *Presbytery* sendeth two or three, or more, by turns, to preach among them; if the People desire to hear yet others; it is granted: And the People chuse whom they like best. Where doth the Artifice lie, that the Candidate can use, except it be to Preach better than another doth? On the other hand, all do know what Artifices to gain a Presentation from a Patron are commonly used: And how seldom it is seen, that a *revired Clergy Man is forced out of his Solitude by the Patron* (which our Author dreameth) *Symoniacal Compacts* and other Sollicitations are far more frequent.

§. 18. He blameth the *Vindicator* (p. 18) for saying that the *Clergy pressed the Consciences of their hearers*: But he is not pleased to let us know what place of the Book this is to be found in, that it might be tried, whether these words were used, or some other words that our Author is pleased to draw to that sense. Also that it might be known on what occasion, and to what purpose, this was said. He saith, *nothing was in our worship but the Lords Prayer, Creed and Densology &c* It was never said by the *Vindicator*, that these were sufficient grounds of separation from the *Episcopal Church*: But it is like he might say that some did scruple some of these, and apprehended that they also had some other Grounds for their not hearing the Ministers that then had the Churches: And as they did run their Scruples too high, on the one hand, so the Ministers did too rigorously prosecute them, on the other hand, For what their Conscience would not suffer them to comply in: And what harm is there in asserting this? It is impueth to the *Vindicator*, as if he had said, that *Presbyterians were not against the use of these Forms, but they would not use them as the Prelatists did*. Where this was said, I know not: Nor is he pleased to quote the place that it might be examined: Whether by these means, the unity of the Christian Church is broken, let any judge who is not blinded with Superstition. Also let it be considered how wisely the *Apologist* compares joyning in these forms with *Subscribing the Confession of Faith*? Surely this Gentleman must either have a low esteem of the Christian Faith contained in that *Confession* of it, or a superlative value for the use of Forms: For we have no controversy with him about the matter that is under these forms of words. It is not true, that *addressers to the General Assembly did plainly declare that they would Subscribe the Westminster Confession, as it contained the Fundamentals of the Protestant Religion*. This is not truly represented nor is there advantage to his design in mentioning it. There was no mention in their *Formula* (and they would not when required, add on word for explaining it) of the *fundamentals of the Protestant Religion*. And if they had so far condescended, what security could such Subscription before their *Orthodoxie*: For the *Fundamentals* are very few; and it is a controversy among Divines, what is their number: And sure if these men dislike any Article of the *Confession* they will alledge it is not fundamental: And indeed by such Subscription they are at liberty to believe, and Preach what they will, On this occasion he declameth (with many words, but nothing of Argument) against the *Presbyterians*; because they would be secure that they whom they receive, be not *Arminians*, as if the *Arminian* controversies were only abstruse, *Metaphysical Notions*; and would have these left as disputable points. But he might have known that the Apostle, by the direction of the unerring Spirit, thought fit to instruct the Church in these points: And is it a Crime in us if we endeavour to explain what he hath taught. And endeavour to secure the Church that nothing be taught that is Contrary. I deny not that the Scholastick way of handling these Controversies, is not fit for the Pulpit; and that the Schoolmen have been very extravagant in this matter: but which of the *Presbyterians* can be charge with this? It is not for not teaching the People the School Notions in these matters that we blame some of his Clergy; but for teaching Error, and that against the plain and positive Doctrine contained in Scripture, and in the Confession of Faith.

§. 19. He proceedeth, p. 9. to another quarrel with his Antagonist: That he laboureth to provoke the present powers against the *Episcopal Clergy* that they are Enemies to King William and Queen Mary, and that he saith the interest of King William and that of the *Presbyterians* is embarked together, and for this he citeth p. 24. The former of these is not in that page; nor any words to that effect: except the latter Assertion; which is there drawn as an Inference from what his Adversary had brought, but whatever he may think of its being a *means complement to King William*, It hath been the observation of Thousands in Scotland. (I say not it is so elsewhere) and it is hard to bear it out of the minds of thinking men. He putteth a strange gloss on this Assertion; *I deff, saith he* if King William doth not observe the original contract; they know well enough what they owe all earthly Kings. This is like the gloss of Orleans. He chargeth his Margin with this sentence, as what must not be left out. For the Fancy, the *Covenants to be the Tenure by which any King may hold his Crown*: This the *Presbyterians* disown, and have convinced all men, (whose malice doth not shut their eyes) to the contrary, by

own.

owning and submitting to Kings who brake the Covenant, disowned it, and made the People abjure it. Such unlimited and unproved affirmations, are more fit to give a Character of the Author of them, than to refute his Antagonist. Another Assertion like this is p. 20. *I know no notion that Presbyterians can have of a King, but that he should be Arch-bede to the Kirk: And that he should imploy his power to execute their Decrees.* And for this he citeth *Sanguair Declaration*, and a saying of the *Provost of Rutherglen*: Which *Presbyterians* never owned. But do abhor such Principles: And therefore all that followeth in his Discourse on this Head falleth to the Ground, viz. That the *Clergy in the West* having never met with any thing but *acts of Hostility, without Law, Tryal, or Justice* (an accusation against the present Government, which giveth a Specimen of the Author) they ought to continue in opposition to King William, by these Principles. Let them who own these Principles defend them, and consider the consequences of them. I do not remember where the *Vindicator* foundeth a *Libel against the Clergy on account of the Doctrine of Non Resistance*: Tho' this he is charged with p. 20. and our Apologist is shy of telling his Opinion about it, p. 21. He well knoweth that this Point hath been debated *hinc inde*, and that not all the *Episcopalians* do stand for it. I am as backward to enter the Lists on this Subject as he is, but am rather willing to observe that many who pleaded vehemently for it, have changed their Principle: Others have practised quite contrary to that Principle, and yet will maintain their old Opinion in defiance of Sense and Reason, sheltering themselves under some distinctions, and explications, that few Men can understand. Tho' our Author will not tell his Opinion directly, yet he doth it intelligibly enough: While he not only condemneth some late Inferences (about which I will not Controvers with him) but telleth us of a *Supreme Tribunal* (which with us is King and Parliament) from which there is no Appeal, and which may not be resisted; by every one whose Caprice is not satisfied; running to Arms. I applaud his Wit not debating this question till he understand it better, and learn to fix to *Corruption*. For I think few sober Men will contradict him in this; whatever they may think of the body of the Nation joining with the *Primores Regni*, resisting the execution of bad Laws, and calling to account the Makers and Executors of them. I will neither debate this, nor determine any thing in it, nor take notice what aspect the late Revolution, and present Settlement hath toward the determination of this question. I shall leave this head, after I have observed a pretty pleasant Argument this high pretender, and despiser of others, bringeth for his Opinion: *Do not we see every day, such as opposed the Government any where, Fined, Confined, or Executed.* If he had hence inferred, Ergo, no Government is willing to be resisted; the consequence could not have been denied: But the conclusion must be Ergo, it is unlawful to resist any Supreme Governour. Some will say it is pitiful Logick.

§. 20. Because he cannot find sufficient ground to blame his Adversary, he thinketh fit to use some Artifices to reach him. He p. 21. citeth the *Vindicator*, affirming, That the *Authority of the Nation in the Convention, or Parliament, may take away the Legal Rights that belongeth to the Clergy.* But he leaveth out what might vindicate that Author, viz. That he expressly leaveth the decision of that question to Lawyers; and giveth no Opinion about it. Here the *Apologist* maketh a heavy complain, of the Arbitrary Power acted by the *Presbyterian Party*, in what the Convention now did, and what the Covenanting Parliaments had done before. I shall here also determine nothing but leave it to Men Learned in the Law, to inform us whether the notion of acting Arbitrarily can agree to the Parliament, where the body of the People with the King are represented (none doubteth but they may act irrationally and wickedly) or if it be peculiar to Executors of the Law when they act not by Law, but take their own will for their Rule. He imputeth to the *Presbyterians* and to the Author of the *Vindicator* p. 22. This Assertion That the kindness that any hath for *Episcopacy* proceeds from the *Episcopal Clergy* their Indulging Men in their Sins and Immoralities. And for this he citeth p. 76. and p. 166. In the former of the two places there is not one word to this purpose: In the other, all that is said is, reproving his Antagonist for saying that *Presbyterians were dreaded as the plague of Mankind.* The *Vindicator* replyeth, That they are not so looked on by any but a debauched Crew, whom his Faction indulged in their Immoralities; to which *Presbyterian Discipline* is a Terror.

Now let the Reader judge whether this Author dealeth fairly? Is this Assertion so universal as he maketh it? Is it said, or hinted at, that none have respect to *Episcopacy* on other accounts, tho' I am perswaded that not a few like it on that account, yet I never thought nor said, that all who are for *Episcopacy* are of that Stamp. I know some of them, Ministers and others, who have Intimoralties. But let us hear his Refutation of this Assertion. What we first meet with is, *this is Spight and Malice: They are Sons of Strife who say so, is is Impudence, it is a senseless Accusation: Who can stand before such Arguments: The force they have is to shew the Man's Spirit who useth them.* I only take notice, that he calleth the Accusation also *indefinite*: Which is most injurious; it is limited to the profligate Persons among the *Episcopal* Party. He cometh next to run down this Assertion, by this want Reason. *The Episcopal Church hath taught no Doctrine that hath any tendency to breaking any of Gods Commandments.* As if no Church could be negligent in the exercise of Discipline, unless it be also her Doctrine, that Discipline should be neglected. He hath Superciliously insulted over the *Indicator*, when nothing so ridiculous or contemptible was said. For another Argument, he saileth with a great deal of scorn and bitterness, on the Discipline exercised in the *Presbyterian* Church against Whoredom. He hath two quarrels against it; the former, *Bringing Whores to receive a publick Rebuke, causeth the murdering of many Bastards*; the other is, *Three Women cannot be named who ever mounted the Publick stool of Repentance but they became Prostitutes, their Publick appearance rendering them Impudent.* Can any think that such Stuff needeth an Answer? That they that sin (*viz.* openly and scandalously) should be rebuked before all, is the expresse Commandment of Christ, by his Apostle, *1 Tim. 5. 20. idest, palam & in publico catu, graviter & severe, increpa.* *saith Estius*, and he was no *Presbyterian*: It is true, he saith, it is likely the Apostle had an eye at the faults of Elders; but he addeth, *Idem tamen faciendum cum aliis.* It is a shame for this Author to speak against the strictness of Discipline against publick Scandals, which even *Papists* allow, when they consider things without the prejudice of the practice of their Church. Yea, *Tertullian. Admonebantur criminosi a senioribus astante & audiente plebs, magno cum pondere.* If this publick Rebuke be given, we are not fond whether the Person be on the *Stool of Repentance* or elsewhere, in the Church, tho' we think it (as our Ancestors did) a convenient place, where the person may be seen and heard by all; as the Minister is in the Pulpit. It is strange that this Author should speak against publick Rebuking of Offenders; for it was ever the practice of the Church of Scotland; even under *Prelacy*; and under the late *Prelacy*; tho' it was not so frequently used as there was need for it: But he is now in *England*, and it seems thinketh himself obliged to rail at all that is not according to the *English* way. That Womens murdering their Bastards is the effect of this Discipline, is a strange Assertion, and an effort of a confidence not to be regarded: It may enervate that wild conjecture, that at the Revolution, seven Women were left in prison in *Edinburgh*, for that one Crime: Each of them murdering their own Infants: Since which time I have heard of none but one or two: For his other inconvenience, what he asserteth, is a manifest falsehood: Some have given evidence of true Repentance; not only by publick profession; but by their after good Conversation: And tho' I will not say, that never any of them turned Prostitutes, yet it is known not to be commonly so; and I may say, I never heard of any that turned to that way, on that occasion. He is pleased to reproach us for too strict observation of the Lord's Day: When he complaineth, that the People are not allowed to have fresh Water. This is false; the prohibition at *Edinburgh* is, that none, on that day, bring Water from the Wells in greater quantity than a Scotch Pint; which is supposed to be, ordinarily, enough for drinking, or for the necessities of the Sick: In any extraordinary case, they may have what they need: But for other uses in Families it is thought as much may be provided on *Saturday* night as may serve for the Sabbath. This is especially necessary in *Edinburgh*, where all that populous City is served by a few Wells, to which great Crowds resort. and often make disturbance, by striving who should be first served, which might occasion much profanation of that Holy Day. His ill words against this Discipline, I overlook, intending only to defend our way against what may look like Argument. After all this, our Author bath the Brow, to wish that the ancient Discipline of the Church

were revived. I would gladly learn of him, what that Discipline is, which is not either the same with ours, or is not a great deal more strict and severe.

§. 21. Thus our *Apologist* hath finished his Defence of the Clergy: With what Success, let the Reader judge: And let it be considered, whether the things that he laboureth to excuse, or justify, were ever charged upon the Clergy; but only on the Pamphleteers refused in that Book which he opposeth: Or on some particular Persons among the Clergy; and if it be found that no such charge is laid against the Clergy; let every one judge, whether he hath not hitherto been fighting with a shadow. His next work (which beginneth p. 26. and filerth up the greatest part of his Book) is to disparage his Antagonist, and Mr. *Rule*; against whom he seemeth to have a particular indignation (it is not hard to guess at the Cause of it) which design he manageth by some very unmanly Methods; to say no worse. Such silly Artifices should be utterly despised, if a matter of more Importance were not struck at then the credit of either of them. They are known (and so is this Author) in Scotland: And every one will judge (some as they know, others as they affect) let him say what he pleaseth: The first thing that he thinketh fit to charge his Adversary with, is *Partiality*. In his attempt to make this appear, he hath a kind of Apology for what he is about to say; which I cannot well reconcile with what followeth; it looketh so like *protestatio contraria factio*: He will not conclude him habitually such as he representeth him to be, but ascribeth his Book to *Paroxysms of Passion*. Here is a high pretence to charitable Judging; some would think that so many acts as must be in composing a Book of so many Sheets, if they did not flow from a previous habit, might at least produce one: But let him call me whether actually, or habitually passionate, as best pleaseth him, if he can make the *Paroxysms* that he talketh of appear, I shall take with blame: But I hope he will, mean while, allow indifferent Readers a liberty of judging of the temper of that mans mind, in writing a Refutation of a Book who could not read it without being provoked to the indecencies of Passion by every line of it; as he saith himself p. 1. The expressions that he taxeth as *unmannerly*, are only so, when they are unduly applied. I suppose there are none in the World of whom every one of them may be said: If he will prove any of these to be imputed directly, or indirectly to his Party (as he often layeth heavier charges to the *Presbyterians*, without exception) or to any person, or more, without cause; when he shall point to the place of my Book where it is done, if I cannot shew that he mistaketh, let him censure at his pleasure; but it is his way (here and elsewhere) to pick up some words, here and there, which he thinketh found harshly, and from these to expose his Adversary, without taking notice where, or on what occasion; or against whom, such expressions were used: Which is an easie way to make any Man black enough; if it be a fair way, if not, it is enough to make himself so. The absurdity of venting Passion in Personal Reflections, he doth justly blame: But doth pitifully lay it off himself, when he telleth us of his fixing nothing on his (the *Vindicators*) person; but what naturally followeth from his own words, or deeds, or some ground given by themselves: Such Reflections are then blameworthy when they are either groundless, or needless; by which let the Reader judge, whether he, or I, be more guilty of venting Passion in personal Reflections. But I have said too long on this preliminary.

§. 22. He proveth the *Vindicator's* Partiality, from his rejecting the Testimony of such as are not of his Party. This is false: His proof is. The Testimony of a Bailly in Glasgow is rejected because he was chosen by the *Archbishop*. It is evident p. 94. (which he citeth) that the story it self is disproved as false, whence it will follow that no Witnesses should be believed in asserting of it: And it is but mentioned *ex abundanti*, that the Bailly, and some others there named; were the less to be regarded, because Men who had shewed much ill will against the *Presbyterians*. If we reject any Episcopal person relating matter of Fact that is probable, and not aliunde found to be false, only because of that persons Opinion about our present differences; let us then bear the blame of *Partiality*. The same is answered to what he citeth out of p. 85, 100. & 109 his great and exact *Historians* Testimony is not rejected; but his accounts are disproved, and his Vouchers found to be insufficient; as the best of Men might be when he is found to assert a Falsehood. What he alledgeth concerning the Writer of the

the first Letter, refuted by the *Vindicator* (who he saith is Mr. Moyer) is far remote from truth; the falsehood of that Authors Histories is asserted, and made evident; but it is no where said, nor hinted, that he was not to be believed because a *Jacobite*. I shall not contradict the *Apologists* account of his Loyalty to King William (tho' some are such Infidels as not to believe the conclusion, though the premises were true) but I judged of the Man by his Book: And I know not what any Man, on such a subject, could have said more against King William's interest. That all the accounts be (the *Vindicator*) had from the West, in defence of the Enemies of the Episcopal Clergy, are thus overthrown with one dash of his Pen. Is a wide mistake: For these accounts were not from any of the Rabblers of the Clergy; but from such as he can make no rational exception against; either for their Morality in their Conversation, or for their concern in that matter: That they (the *Presbyterians*) are obliged by their Oaths to ruin *Episcopacy*, would indeed be to his purpose, if he could make it appear, that the Covenants, or any other Oath, doth bind us to tell lies, or use any means, good or bad, toward that end: But if that be false (as all do know) let it be considered, what Morality, or Argumentative Skill, the Man is Master of, who doth so boldly affirm this, and maketh such inference from it.

§. 23. Another thing whereby he endeavoureth to vilifie his Adversary (for that is the professed scope of this part of the *Apology*) is, he is for the divine right of *Presbytry*. If he, or any of his party, could disprove this Opinion (which I have not yet seen, nor expect to see) yet I think few, except this Author, will think this sufficient to render a man contemptible: Many with whom the *Vindicator* will not compare, and to whom I think the *Apologist* is not equal, are of the same Opinion: And have strenuously maintained it; and if it be so ridiculous to assert the Divine Right of *Presbytry*, what is it, to write and think so of *Episcopacy*? as the *Apologist* doth p. 21. where he calleth it the *Apostolical Government*: if it be Apostolical it must be Divine; for the Apostles were guided by a Divine, and infallible Spirit. If our Author would have made us ridiculous on this head; it might have been expected, that he should have refuted this opinion, and answered what is said for it, with such strength and evidence, as was able to captivate the understandings of all men, except they were Idiots, as he seemeth to reckon the *Presbyterians*; but that was too hard a task for him; and therefore he wisely forbearth to meddle with it. What he bringeth to prove the absurdity of his Opinion, is far short of what others of his Party have said, and a very weak bottom to found his confidence upon. The first *Presbyterians* held Church Policy to be variable; and for this he citeth the *Confession of Faith* inserted in the Oath of the Test (it seems he knoweth the *Confession of Faith* of the first Scotch Protestants under no other designation) It is evident to any who readeth that *Confession*, that there is nothing said in that place of Government, whether Parity, or Prerogative; but of Policy, and order of Ceremonies; and Ceremonies here must needs be taken in a large sense, for External Rites common to other publick actions, beside Church Administrations: For they expressly condemn Humane Ceremonies in Gods Worship. If another person had reasoned at this rate, it would have been improved by our Author, as a part of the Character of such a Writer. He taketh it very ill p. 25. That the *Presbyterian* Church will not own themselves as Delegates of the State: As if they acted against the Sentiments of the whole Nation, and against common Sense; which do determine that they could have no power over the *Episcopal Clergy* but what they derived from the State: Our Author doth little consider wthom he disoblige, by his loose talk. Even that part of the Church of England, to please whom, this and most of their Pamphlets are calculated: Tho' he will not read the Books of the *Presbyterians*, because they stir his Choler; I wish he would read a late piece about *Christian Communion*, on behalf of the *deprived Bishops*; where it is asserted and strongly pleaded, That the Church in matters purely Spiritual (and such the Government of the Church; is by him asserted to be, as much as the Administration of the Sacraments) is altogether independent on any other Power whatsoever: Wherefore there are other Men, as well as *Presbyterians*, so ridiculous, in this Writer's Eyes, as to Jeny Church Assemblies for Government to be Delegates of the State. For the *Presbyterian* Churches power over *Episcopal* Men, they have it by their Office, over all the Members of the Church of Scotland; whatever be their opinion about Government: Tho' we own it, as the favour of the State, that we have its countenance in the

the exercise of this Government: Another of his wise reasonings, Calvin said, *Honour and Reverence* due to Prelates, etiam hoc nomine, if they embrace the Reformation: Ergo. His Disciples are absurd, in being loath that any other Policy should prevail. Here is no shadow of consequent. Calvin was as unwilling as we are, that *Episcopacy* should prevail; whatever respect he, or we, might have to the person of a *Bishop*, who embraceth the Truth. That it is in any part of the *Vindication* said or insinuated, that they who are not for *Presbytry*, of the Divine Right of it, are not acquainted with the *Spirit of God*, is most false, and injuriously limed, by our Author: He might have seen in the page that he citeth, it is said of some, on a quite different account. If he can, make it appear that his Antagonist doth thus write at random, let him Characterize him as he pleaseth.

§ 24. Another thing whereby he thinketh to make his Antagonist absurd and odious, is, his *Rudeness and Vanity*. p. 25. I hope he looketh on these two qualities as distinct: And is obliged to prove them both; whereas I find nothing that looketh like an attempt to prove the latter. But it will not be difficult to retort it on himself, by any who considereth the Supercilious strain of his writing, and his contempt of his Adversary: For the former, his proof is, *The Vindicator represents his Adversary as a Liar, and Villain: Tho' he cannot prove that the Author of the History of the General Assembly wrote one Lie: If his Informations were not exact, he is not to blame: But it cannot be proved that any Information he got was false.* A. He should have shewed where he was represented as a Villain, for I do not remember it, and no place is cited, unless he take a Liar and a Villain for the same. It is a pleasant Vindication from being his Information was not exact: Our Author here would shew his Critical Skill; but do we not in ordinary Speech call gross Falsehoods, Lies, not considering the knowledge or intent of the Speaker? And all that was said was, that the things wrote were Lies. Which was abundantly made evident, and is known to most in Scotland: Tho' our Author hath the brow to say, *that it cannot be proved.* To impute so absurd things to so publick a meeting, where were so many Witnesses to attest the Falsehoods of them, and to transmit these to Posterity in Writing; let every one judge by what softer term it could be called: Whether he, or his Informers be the Liars, we are little concerned: But Wise Men will think that neither can be excused, Beside, are there not many things insinuated by the *Vindicator*, as asserted by his Adversary, in which it is hard to think that the Mans Mind did not contradict his Thoughts: As p. 36. *They (the Presbyterians, and no exception or distinction made) divide from the Catholic Church in all Ages, they pervert and alter the nature of the Gospel, and teach another Gospel than what is to be found in Scripture.* And p. 64. *If you will take their (the Presbyterians) word for it, they are the only true Godly, and who only have a sense of Religion, and the practice of it.* I hope he hath not these Assertions by Information; and therefore must bear the blame himself of such notorious Falsehoods, which is impossible for any intelligent Man, who hath long conversed in Scotland, not to know to be such. What is said of the Councils leaving the Case of the Clergy to the determination of the Parliament, is strangely improved, viz. That it is the *Vindicator's Doctrine*, that the Council may stop, and dissolve the Laws. He would think it Vanity indeed, if I should impute the making of such an inference to his Ignorance in the way of Arguing; wherefore I leave the Reader to ascribe it to what he thinketh most probable: Only I may adventure to say, it is absurd to infer the approbation of a Fact, or the asserting of a Legal Power for doing that Act, from a bare Narrating that such an Act was done: Which is all that the *Vindicator* can be charged with, about that deed of the Council.

§ 25. Tho' our Author is pleased to take no notice of the most material passages in the Book that he refuteth, and which most directly promote the design of it: Yet he is very exact in picking up, here and there, a word dropped on the by, tho' of lesser importance, which himself reproacheth in his Antagonist; and which might more deserve the imputation of a *creeping Genius* than any thing he taketh notice of p. 55. to fix it on another. When one of the *Pamphleteers* refuted by the *Vindicator*, had called our Church Meetings for Discipline, *Presbyterian Clubs*, in Contempt; he is told we have no Clubs for drinking: Hence the *Apologist* wisely inferreth, He insinuateth that the Clergy had Clubs for drinking: Which yet he doth not endeavour to disprove: There might be proof enough of Clubs for

for drinking among some of them: It was never said, nor thought by us, that all of them are guilty that way. When a matter of Fact is decided, that Dr. Robison and Mr. Malcolm made application to Presbyterian Jurisdiction, to be received to a share of the Government: He will not affirm the equity of that passage; but he confidently averreth, as *certainly known*, that if he (Dr. Robison) had so done, he had been rejected; because he was one of the Ministers of Edinburgh. And he telleth us what I (nor I think none else) never knew. That the Party had determined to break through all Obstacles of Justice and Decency, rather than suffer any of the Episcopal Clergy, or any who had made any advances of compliance, to continue in Edinburgh: And proveth this by the case of Mr. Willkie. This Diviner (by a kind of *scientia media*) can tell not only what hath been, and what should be, but what will be in *futuris contingentiis*, or *conditionatis*: Yea, he taketh upon him to tell of some resolutions taken, that never were so much as moved, or determined, in any Church Assembly. The influence he bringeth doth overturn and falsifie all that he here saith: For Mr. Willkie, who once complied, is to this day preaching in Edinburgh, hath a publick Church, and a Congregation in it, is received by the Presbyterian Church to a share of the Government; and sitreth constantly in the Presbytery, and other Meetings. In the very next p. 27. he chargeth the *Vindicator* with that which hath all the marks of a deliberate and wilful Lie, because he misrepresenteth, as is alledged, a matter of Fact, that he might have known. What then must we think of this Author, who not only affirmeth what every one knoweth to be false in matter of Fact, but ministerially determineth contrary to manifest and known Truth, about Mens purposes and inclinations: He would do well to be more sparing of his Censures, lest they recoil on himself.

S. 26. He will omit the Clownish buffoonry in the 4th page; and it was wisely done: For nothing of that kind can be instanced. But he telleth us p. 26. of *Epigrams* given by the *Vindicator*, to his Adversary, impudent Slanderees, Villains, (this he often observeth, but pointeth to no place, nor do I remember it) Successors of Jude Iscariot, Rascals: And mocking is all the observation that he maketh on what he is offended at. If he had pleased to point to the places, I should have considered them; but I am confident to say, that where the Reader meeteth with any such words, he will find, that they are occasioned by some Story told, or some imputation laid on Presbyterians, that is either openly false, or sufficiently disproved; and there is no harm in giving things their true names: But if he can show that ever I gave such Names to Episcopal Men, in commune (as he often doth to the Presbyterians) I shall bear all the blame that he shall please to load me with. Is it not strange that he speaketh with such Commotion, and Indignation, on occasion of such words used on just grounds; while this is his own ordinary Dialect: And that against his Adversaries in general. I shall give instances in particular parts of his Book (which he thought not fit to favour us with) *Vanity*, *Partiality*, *Sophistry*, are imputed to his Adversary as the Ornaments of the Title Page of this *Apology*. *Enthusiastick pretences*, ad page of the Contents. *They have made Lies their refuge*, p. 1. *Truth doth not please them*, unless it be dressed up in all the Colours of Falshood, *ibid*. *Presbyterians never forgive any Injury*, p. 3. *The body of the people in the West are Cunning, Swartious, and Dissembling, beyond measure*, *ibid*. *In their (the Presbyterians) Dignity, things lawful in their nature, yet, things necessary, become unlawful when once commanded by lawful Authority*, p. 4. *Spillen and desperate Incendiaries*, p. 12. *They think that they who act against them, act against their own light*, *ibid*. *They justify one Crime by another: And justify their Treachery from Success*, as the Turks do, p. 13. *They date their Conversion from the time they forbear to hear the Cupes*, p. 15. It is insinuated, that we think Snipelling necessary to make a great Saint: Many of the Ministers are Scandalous: Some Adulterers: Some Fornicators: Some Blasphemers: *Whole Families incestuous*, *ibid*. *No sin was preached against but Malignancy; and the Kings Prerogative Royal was possessed by the Kirk*, p. 17. *Sublimem*, *They fancy the Covenant to be the Tenure by which Kings hold their Crowns*, p. 19. *Margine*. *They who defended the Convention of Estates are called Pagabond Russians*, p. 26. *A Presbyterian had rather be accused of Adultery, Sodomy and Incest, then to be thought ignorant*, p. 31: ad finem: *The Spirit of Contradition eats out the Vitals of his Soul; and ever and anon puts him upon silly and extravagant Impertinencies*, p. 30.

Peddling little Reformers p. 37. It is rare, in the West, to find a *Presbyterian* Child that can repeat the Creed, or ten Commandments. p. 42. *Spice and Ill Nature*, is ascribed to his Adversary. These are a few of the Flowers of his Rhetorick. I must transcribe much of his Book if I shou'd mention all that is of this strain. Now let the Reader judge where the Imputation of *Rudeness*, *Ill Nature*, *False Accusation*, and *Lying*, may be most justly fixed.

§ 27. He telleth us, p. 26. (in despite of the Instances to the contrary, that his Book is bespangled with) that he had rather prove the *Vindicator* a Liar than call him so. His proof is, The *Vindicator* said that the *Vicount* of Dundee, and others, had gathered together two thousand of the last Kings disbanded Forces as Edinburgh. He will have this to be no less than a willful and deliberate Lye; according to his usual Modesty, and Charity. He seemeth to suppose that the *Vindicator* will have them believe that the number was just so many and not one more or fewer: Otherwise his questions *who saw them Mustered*, and *where?* were impertinent; which were a Crime to surmise of one who locketh down from such a height on other Morals, as this *Soring* Author doth. I was not in Edinburgh, nor in the Nation when this was acted, but had information from persons of as good Intelligence, and as much Veracity as any in the Nation: And not only (what he denieth) but 30 or 60 in Edinburgh will affirm: that there were then gathered together at Edinburgh, and about it, a great number of King James's disbanded Forces, which by a modest and rational estimate, might be reckoned to two thousand: And there was as great evidence as the thing was capable of, that Dundee, and others were upon a design to employ them against the Convention, and this was the ground of that prudent Care that was used, to call in some from the West, to guard the Convention: All this our Author laboureth not to disprove only, but to ridicule (beside the Topicks above mentioned) by others, as weighly. It is like (saith he) that Dundee, at the head of two thousand, could be forced to retire from Edinburgh. A. He was no other way forced than that his designs were disappointed: And he thought he could effect them better in the Highlands: Whether he straight went; and gathered a greater Force than these two thousand: Many of whom it is like followed him thither. Again, when he went from Edinburgh he had not above thirty or forty to attend his person. A. Doth this prove that he had no more in Edinburgh who were Friends to him, and his Designs? It was not yet time to appear in his full strength. The *Vindicator* might not give a check to Mr. Morer's confidence of the event of the High-land War, if Dundee had lived; but the *Apologist* must have a harangue on this, as if we judged all the Episcopal Men to be Atheists. We disown such a consequence. What he farther chargeth me with, about Dr. Canaries, is fully answered in a Letter to the Doctor, in answer to one that he had written to a Person, whom he supposeth to be the Author of the *Vindication*. It is there shewed that the Doctor gave advice, that they should apply to the Presbyterian Church; that it was evident to all, that their Application was on terms that they could not once dream could be satisfying: And this is called *Feigned Obedience*; which words are put in *Italic* Letters, as being a noted Word in Scripture, and contained the substance of what was to be expressed. The *Apologist*, I perceive, hath seen this answer to the Doctor's Letter; and yet is not pleased to answer what was brought to prove, that the whole of this Address was a Sham; and the obedience that they gave was *Feigned Obedience*. Some fancy they may triumph over their Adversaries, if they can discourse a little on a word or two of what is said while they leave the substance untouched.

§ 28. His Vindication of Mr. McMath, p. 28, 29. cometh next to be considered: Whom he saith, the *Vindicator* injures most atrociously. If it be so, he ought to crave pardon, and will do it: But I see no proof of any wrong done him. 1st. Saith our *Apologist*, he chargeih him with drunkenness. All that is said of that is, No sickness was seen on him, but what was the effect of his being drunk over night; which all that know him affirm was very customary to him. This the *Apologist* concludeth (according to his solid and conclusive way of reasoning) because two Gentlemen saw him that very night before he came from Edinburgh, without appearance of being drunk. Might not he drink to excess, after he parted with these Gentlemen? And this is no conjecture, for he was seen drunk, by the way going home, that night. What remains of his discourse about Mr. McMath; for answer to it, I give the very words of

of an Information I have from *Leiswade*; attested by the subscription of one whose Veracity none that knoweth him will question. "The Woman (whom the *Apologist* saith was hired by the *Presbyterians*, to say that Mr. *McMath* made Love to her) was never hired by the *Presbyterians*, nor persuaded by any Person; which she will upon Oath declare before any Judge. The Man who ript up his own Belly had never any concern with Mr. *McMath*; he was a Man, destitute of Piety, and of a treacherous disposition. *John Clare*, who was killed with the fall of a Tree, never bear Mr. *McMath*, with Musket, nor any other Weapon. Mr. *Borwick*, is yet alive and in his right mind, nor was he ever distracted in the least. Mr. *Finlanson* adhereth to what he said, and saith no greater Injury can be done him then to say that he denieth it. For the Certificate: Tho' the *Apologist* seemeth to lay such weight on it, as able to silence what hath been, or can be said, against Mr. *McMath*; Wise Men will judge that there are many places in which the worst of Men will get as great a number to own him in so large a Parish: And these are all who did own Mr. *McMath*, of 300 or 400 Adult Persons, of which that Parish consisteth. Other Objections might be made against it; but enough is said p. 30. he is angry with the *Vindicator* for saying, That the *Episcopal Party* made all the *Essays* they were capable of, to carry the Elections for the Convention. And this he reluteth solidly, after his manner: For in several Shires the *Episcopal Gentry* declined to be Elected, particularly in *Ross*, where the *Presbyterians* cannot carry the Elections. If he had read the Book that he reluteth, with a more undisturbed mind, he might have seen, in p. 12. which he citeth, that all this, and more is yielded, viz. That they carried the Elections in some places. Neither do we deny, but that some of the *Episcopal Party* might shun to be Elected (as some did shun to sit when Elected) for the Shire of *Ross*; I do not pretend to know it so well as the *Apologist* doth: But one Instance will not inlringe the Assertion, which speaketh only of many, or most part; and doth expressly except some. When he findeth, that the Instances he hath scraped together may prove too weak to prove the *Vindicator* so horrid and so empty a Person as he would repent him; he bringeth as strong an Argument, as any yet mentioned, and that is, he saith it positively and boldly: To be short (saith he) his Book is every where interspersed with the silliest *Shuffling* and *Tergiversation*. Yet another Instance of the *Vindicators* rudeness, and flying in his *Adversaries* Face, and giving him the Eye, when it were enough to say that he is not acquainted with the Matter of Fact; Mr. *Morer* had asserted, that some sat in the Convention who were not *sects* in their Estates: This he denieth (these are the *Apologists* words) and telleth us, this was a sufficient answer because no Person was named. Is not this a formidable Argument to prove this Assertion? Who can stand before a Man of such a Talent? Where is the Rudeness? Where is the flying in Mr. *Morer*'s Face? And giving him the Lie? The *Vindicator*'s Inconsistencies is the Task he next undertakes p. 30, 31. He finds (or fancies) three or four of them in that Book: One is, he hath treated his *Adversaries* as Brethren; yet he insinuateth that such Disputes with the *Episcopal Party* is but *strugglings* between the Seed of the Woman, and the Seed of the Serpent. A. Where is this insinuated? Here is mention made indeed, of that struggle: But is it any where hinted that he debatch against the *Episcopal Party*? Is it not rather evident from the whole strain of the Book, that it is some Writers of that Party, that had filled their Pamphlets with Lies and Railing, that many Sober Men of their own side are ashamed of: And it is shewed, in the same place, that he citeth, Si. 6. of the Prefaces how consistent the sharpness that sometimes he useth is with that Brotherly respect that is due to such unfair Dealers: Our Lord did not disown Peter, tho' he called him *Satan* to reprove his Error: Yea, we may treat even them as Brethren, who are justly Excommunicated by the Church. Another inconsistency is, He is acquainted with but few of the Matters of Fact: Yes he taketh no things on hear-say, or common talk: This is pure trifling: Where one hath a Matter of Fact on the Testimony of two or three Persons of known Veracity; and, may be, witnessed upon Oath, before a Judge: Is not here a Medium between Personal Knowledge, and Common Talk: Wherefore there is here no Inconsistency, nor Contradiction, which any one can imagine; except such a one as the Author of the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, who objecteth the same. That the Materials of the Vindication are but the Testimonies of them who were the Actors, or Abettors of the Western Villanies (the civil word that this severe

Censure

Censurer of *Rudens's* *Use*) is most false. The story about Mr. George Henry was not built on common talk only; but on the Testimony of one who pretended personal knowledge, and if it were a mistake, it can no way disparage the other Historical Passages, because it tended no way to reflect on Mr. Henry, but rather to vindicate him, and no stress of anything in debate did lye on it. Another mighty inconsistency; *He tells us they do not look on King William as an Idolater, and yet some Preach that the Church of England is Idolatrous*: It is pity to trouble the Reader with such stuff, but some Mens mouths must be stopped. Here is no Inconsistency, unless he could shew that either the Author hath said both these: Or that all *Presbyterians* hold them both. If farther answer to this were needed, it should be brought. Lastly, *He will not allow that the Clergy who addressed the Commission had any wit* (I know not where that is said or hinted; tho' I am sure they did not act wisely, in that matter) and yet their Contrivances were founded on deep Consuls. I will not impute to this Reverend Author that ignorance of a Contradiction, that some will gather from this passage. May not some who have much wit, be lar from using it, in some cases? Again, may not Men who have little wit, have what they are to act concerned for them, by them who have more wit? We know also that all deep Contuaks are not wise Consuls. I hope our Author hath much more Wit, and Learning too than he is wish in this and several other passages of his Book: And yet I am far from thinking (whatever dirt he is pleased to cast on others) that he is destitute of either.

§. 29. Our Authors next work from p. 31. to the end of 37. is to disparage Mr. Rule, whom he treateth with a great deal of insolent Contempt. Some may think this whole discourse impertinent, and wide from the matter in hand. For the *Vindication* may contain solid Reason, and hard to be refused; yet, the *Presbyterians* may be generally, Men of worth, tho' Mr. Rule were as bad, or as Ridiculous, as our Author can call him, or wish him to be. And if Mr. Rule, have said any thing absurdly in a piece he wrote against Dr. Stillingfleet, what is that to make either the Histories incredible, or the Reasons invalid, which are contained in the *Vindication*. This Conduct will readily make some to guess at what moved this Author so to digress: That either he had little to fill his facets with (tho' he often brags of plenty) or that he is glad of any occasion given, or that can be searched, to meet with a Person whose place he envied, whatever thoughts he have of his Principles. I shall say nothing in answer to the civil words he frankly bestoweth on him; such as *Proud and Supercilious*, p. 31. *Nothing so palpably ignorant and foolish*, *ibid.* *Resenteth the least contradiction to his Nonfence*, *with Bitterness and Indignation*. *Thrasonical boasting*, p. 34. *Silly and extravagant Impertinences*: *a Merm of a Scholar*, p. 36. *Arrogant and Presumptuous*, p. 37. I neither incline to resent these, nor may safely do it, considering in what a fit of Passion (above Indecency) it put him; when a very modest Apology was made against some such Delamations before; and that not against one Man, but against all the *Presbyterians*: That (p. 31. ad finem) *a Presbyterian had rather be accused of Adultery, Sodomy, or Incest, than to be thought Ignorant*: If these be the words of Truth or Soberness, the Reader will judge. I shall also say but little of the things that he chargeth my Friend with: Nor will I trouble the Reader with a *Vindication* of him, or of my self; farther than the interest of Truth doth require. The first thing he quarrelleth (as also his Friend the Author of the *History of the General Assembly* had done) is, That *Rational Defence of Nonfornity*, p. 164. he had expounded a passage of *Jerome*, contrary to the Sense that commonly it is taken in: And this he insulteth upon, as a sign of the most unparalleled Ignorance. But as wise as he will think (even supposing it to be a mistake and that it cannot be defended) that it is consistent with more Learning than ever Mr. Rule pretended to, or than our Apologist is Master of. Some Learned men have had odd apprehensions of some things, and which easily might be refused. Great the wonder of his Age for Learning and for Critical Skill in particular, yet will have *arrivatus* 1 Cor. 12. 28. to be *Dioctian Bishops*: So also Dr. Hammond, but he giveth a ground for his Opinion; that is very singular, *arrivatus* (saith he) *Significat curam rei alienius gerere*: And so also he expoundeth that word Luke 1. 54. which is contrary, or at least without Commemoration from, all *Lexicographers, Critics*, and other *Expositors*: If such a great Light may have a Spot, why may not also *Dion Tapers*; without being a spot Snuff. Again, if Mr.

Rule were answering for himself, it is like he would say, that, Veneration for this Learned Father, did drive him into that untrodden path; who cannot otherwise be defended from contradicting, by that expression, the whole of that Epistle, in which it is found: For it Ordination of Presbyters be not in the power of Presbyters, but only of the Bishop, as the sentence now in debate doth plainly import. If it be expounded in the ordinary way: This destroyeth the Identity of Bishops and Presbyters. Which he had been largely, and of purpose proving: Or we must say (which is also mentioned in the place cited) that *Jerome* wrote sometimes his own Opinion, and sometimes that of others: and that so intermixed, as that it is hard for the Reader to discern them, as himself confesseth in a passage there also cited: And if he use such Liberty in matters of Opinion, why not, in taking the same word in divers significations? And it is certain, that not only all Lexicographers give the signification of *ordinare*; but in the Scripture *διατάττω* is turned, *ordino*, 1 Cor. 7. 17. And that signification of it is not unknown in Antiquity, *Cens. Magd* 1 lib. 2. c. 4. p. 203. Edit. Basil 1564. *Evangelium non tollit politicas ordinationes, per se non impias*. I hope this is not meant of ordaining Persons to Office, but ordering and appointing the due management of Affairs. The Reasoning by which he maketh Mr. Rule's Exposition to be inferred is ridiculous enough: But it is none of his, but the Apologist's own. From what is said, all the instances of the use of that word for *possessive mission*, appear to be inconcludent; for they only prove that that is the more usual signification of it: Which none deny: And the Ridiculous Sense that he putteth on this place of *Jerome*, from the use of the Word elsewhere, is Inconsequential: For the Sense given may, and doth, quadrat here, tho' it do not in some other places. Ye may either take *Jerome's* word *Ordinatio* in the more Grammatical, and proper, tho' less usual Sense; and make the passage Congruous to the whole of his discourse, in which it is: Or in the more frequent, but less proper Sense, and look on this Sentence as none of his own: but what others said, and he had set down in his *Adversaria*: And so it cannot derogate from his Opinion about Bishops, expressed in that Epistle. The Reader hath his Option. The Cause that Mr. Rule pleadeth, and his Reputation, are safe either way.

§. 30. He lasheth the *Vindicator*, very severely, with all Rods that his Invention, and the help of Latin Authors that he had read, can afford, because when his Adversary complained of the Desolations of Colleges, by the late Change, and of the Insufficiency of them who were put in the room of such as were Ejected; he very modestly denied that they had any thing to brag of; did appeal to the esteem of Impartial Men; and to the Indicia of Learning any had given, this is wound up to the high degree of *Thrausomical Boasting*: As if his Party were Modest and Humble Men, when they Monopolize all Learning to themselves, and would make the World believe that it will dye with them: But Presbyterians are proud if they Mutter; and do not tamely assent when they are trampled on with the greatest Insolency. I doubt not but the Apostle's Enemies said the same of him, when he maintained his Zeal, and Diligence: nor that Job's angry Friends did the like, when he pleaded for his Wisdom, and Understanding. He should also have considered that there was no Comparison made of any one Man with another, but of one Party with another; and that he cannot fix Self Commendation on any Man (so that his Citations to that purpose are wholly impertinent) but one Man commending those of his way. And I am still confident to say (let him make what use of it he will) that tho' the Person beset with his great displeasure against, were as insignificant as he imagineth; yet the rest who enjoy Places in Universities in Scotland need not be ashamed of their Sufficiencies, whether considered with respect to their Work, or with comparison to their immediate Predecessours. His three Instances of Mr. Rule's speaking false *Latine*, as himself calleth them Impertinencies p. 36. so do I judge them: If they were all true they are nothing to the determination of the debate between the two Parties of the Church, now in Scotland; and tho' he doth not think himself above a possibility of such escapes; and hath heard some who pretend to more Volubility in the *Latine*, and in the *English* too, and value themselves upon it, lapse into as sensible blunders (for ἀμαρτυρία καὶ σφοδρὸς σπουδὴ) yet he doth positively deny that, to his knowledge, or what he hath ever heard from any Person, there is truth in any one of these Instances; and that this *Apology* gave him the first

notice of them. Beside, it is evident that the *Apologist's* Eye and Ear Witnesses have misinformed him, as to the first Instance. For he having had *Prælections*, for some time, *de Idololatriæ*; hath insisted on the Idolatry of the Heathen, of the *Jewish* Church in her degenerate times, and of the *Papists*; but hath not meddled at all, either with the *Superstition* or *Idolatry* of the Church of *England*. Only the Contriver of the Story was pleased thus to circumstantiate it. For the other two Instances, our *Apologist* sheweth as little Skill in Critical Learning as he thinketh others to have in speaking of *Latine*: (tho' he could not forbear the pedantry of trying it, by a fought occasion) For if he consult his *Lexicons* he will find that *Requiro* doth signify to require, or demand: Whatever it signify beside, tho' I deny not, but he who is accused might, and I am perswaded did, express the thing in other terms more common than this. His Criticism on the third Instance is also Childish; For *Statum Regni*, signifieth the state and condition of the Nation; or the present constitution, or settlement of it: And can no ways be put for *Ordines Regni*: But that our Author, or his Informers, knew the Speaker's mind, that he so intended it, as they would have it: But of this too much. He mentioneth also the same Author asserting a *doctrinum præteritum & prædammum*, which I confess, were it truly chargeable upon him, he ought to be ridiculed for Nonfence; and censured for Blasphemy: But because our Author, fond of this occasion of triumph over his Adversary, insisteth again, and more fully on this p. 51. 52. I shall reserve my answer to this Charge, till I come at that place of his Book. Whether he hath shewed that *good nature* and *Christian Modesty*, that he speaketh of p. 37. in hiding and extenuating the weaknesses of others, or the contrary temper, in false accusations, in needless exposing, and aggravating these supposed defects; and in most bitter lashes of his Pen, on occasion of this his apprehension; let the Reader judge.

§ 31. He chargeth his Adversary most injuriously, p. 37. with apparent *Shufflings* and *Tergiversations*: And for proof, bringeth this Instance, That when some of the Clergy were beat on the Head, and Legs, and others made to go through deep Waters, in the midst of Winter; he looketh on these as no great Injuries. If he had pointed the Reader to the places where these Histories are mentioned; his own Eyes might have informed him that this is not true: It is neither said, nor insinuated, that these were no great Injuries: Tho', maybe, some of the aggravating Circumstances, with which they are told, are said to be false. Another thing in the same and the next page, he maketh a hideous outcry about, *viz.* That Ecclesiastical Judicatories that enquire into Scandal are not obliged to follow the forms of other Courts. This is not fair dealing (to say no worse) my Assertion was neither so Universal nor so Positive: The words were; For the former two, it is questionable whether these things, *viz.* Telling who was the Accuser and hearing the accused before the Validity of the Libel be sustained) be required in a Process about Scandal, before an Ecclesiastical Judicatory: But whether it be so or not, I am sure it was otherwise done, for the most part, then he affirmeth. As I then spake doubtingly of this matter, so I am not like to be determined by the force of the *Apologist's* Arguments: That forms are appointed to prevent Forgeries, and Combinations: That they are the External Fences of Justice and Equity: That this is the most intolerable slavery of the Inquisition. There are indeed some forms which may have such use: But that all the forms of Civil Courts are such, or that these mentioned are of that consideration, he will find it hard to prove: Without which nothing is said to the purposes. If the Crime charged on any person be indeed of weight to infer a Censure; and if it be sufficiently proved: I see not how Forgery, Combination, or the Slavery of the Inquisition (where a Man must be his own Accuser, and Witness against himself) can have place. That this is no singular Opinion of the *Vindicator* (he had given opinion about it) nor of the Scotch Presbyterians, he may see, if he will read *Synodus in Gall. reformat: Discipline: cap. 5. Can. 12. All possible care shall be taken that those Formalities, and terms that are used in Courts of Law, may be avoided in the exercise of Church Discipline.* One may often meet with this same Principle in the History of these famous Churches. There are some modes of managing Affairs which are built on Reason, common to all Societies: These, no doubt, the Church also is obliged to observe: Others, tho' Reason may be alledged for them, yet these are such as respect especially the preservation of Man's Civil Rights; and of these I understand

desist and the above mentioned Cases: And these, many Judge needfuls, if not unfit, to be used in Church Discipline: Where the design is, to convince the Sinner, and preserve the Purity of the Church. If a strict adherence to *Law forms* were necessary in Church Discipline, it were needful that all Ministers and Elders should study a *Style Book* and the practice of Civil Courts: Which I think few will averre. Next p. 38. He layeth to the *Vindicator's* charge, *Shameful Juggling* (a Metaphor taken from playing at Cards, which he useth *ad nauseum*) because he saith p. 50. That they (the *Presbyterians*) expressed, as much as they were capable, their dislike of the *Toleration* granted by King James to the *Papists*, when mean while their Agents at Court wrote Books for repealing the Penal Statutes against *Papists*. This were indeed blame worthy, if he could make it appear, that any who wrote such Books were Agents for the *Presbyterians*; or had allowance from them for what they did: But the *Vindicator* and *Presbyterians* too, are clear. If it appear (as it is certainly true) that this was generally disliked by the *Presbyterians*. What he addeth out of p. 6. of requiring, that they to whom we will allow *Toleration* can shew as good warrant for their way; is disingenuously, and lamely represented: For it is not said, we will allow *Toleration* to none else: And no more was meant but that there are some ways so apparently absurd, and unreasonable, that we think they should not be Tolerated: It was also added, *Who use their liberty with the same moderation and peaceableness*: On both which accounts we think *Papists* ought not to be tolerated, to exercise their idolatries, and teach their Heresie. He concludeth this part of his Book, with the same Charity and Civility that hath often been observed in it, viz. He (the *Vindicator*) is so deeply tainted with the sullenness of his Faction, that he'll rather question whether the Body of the Sun be Luminous, than admit the least scruple concerning the Divine Rights of Presbytery. I have no answer to such talk, but leave it to the Reader to judge whether this be Disputing or Railings.

§. 32. The next thing that the *Apologist* thinketh fit to take notice of is, the *Theological Reasonings* that he findeth, here and there, in the *Vindication*, not insisted on but occasionally touched: And that as occasion was given by the Adversaries. If he had pleased to argue closely and fairly on these heads, I should like better to enter the Lists with him, on such subjects, than on what he hath hitherto led me into. The *venomous Squibs* that he blameth me for, I should have examined whether they deserve that name; and have craved pardon for them if they indeed were such: But neither of these I can do; for he hath neither told us what they are, nor where to be found. The first Controversie that he engageth in, is about the observation of *Christmas*, p. 19. on which he discourseth to p. 418 The most difficult part of my task in answering him, is to pick out of his long Harangue, what hath any shew of Argument: For I have seldome read so many words, on a controverted point of Divinity, in which there was less of Argument, and the Reasons that are hinted, are so confusedly interlarded with what is little to the purpose; and so distinct one from another, and there are so many little digressions, and some Of them false History, that it is not easie to follow him: But I shall endeavour to overlook nothing that hath any seeming weight against what we hold. I had denied, that the Court of Heaven celebrated the Anniversary of Christ's Nativity. This he ridiculeth: Because the Angels (Luke 2. 23.) Celebrated the Nativity of Christ, and the Church, in imitation of them, do yearly Celebrate it. A. The question is not, whether we ought to thank God for the birth of Christ, as the Angels did: But whether a day should be separated from the rest of the days in the year: And made Holy by Men, when God hath made no day Holy but one in a week, which the Angels did not do. Another strong Argument he hath in, *Might not the Church take care that this glorious mystery should never be forgotten*. A. No doubt but she might, and should: And the Lord hath appointed a way how this should be done; while the History of this Glorious mystery is written in the Scriptures, which the Lord hath appointed to be read, and explained, and applied, by his Ministers to the end of the World: But hath not enjoined it to be done by observing a Holy day for it: The question is not about the Commemoration of it; but whether this Commemoration should be by an Ordinance of God, or by an Appointment of Men? We know that Christ hath appointed his death to be Commemorated, and therefore we Celebrate his Holy Supper for that end; because he hath instructed

ted it: But we do not keep *Good-Friday* in remembrance of Christs death, because he hath not injoyed it. *Dies Christo dicatos tollendos existimo. Judicoque* (saith *Danans*) *quotidie nobis, in Evangelii predicatione, nascitur, circumciditur, moritur, resurgit Christus.* Another Argument, or what he pleaseth to call it, is, *Could the Christian Church take more effectual methods to preserve the memory of it than by this Anniversary Festival.* *A. Yes, viz.* By reading and hearing the word: For I am of opinion (and must be so till I see stronger Reasons than any here produced) that Christs Institutions are more effectual methods toward attaining what they are appointed for, then mens devices can be. His next Argument is from the *Antiquity* of this usage: And indeed herein lyeth the strength of his Cause, such as it is: And therefore we have this over and over again; his Pages are full of the *Universal Church, the practice of all Nations, &c.* I have not met with an Author who useth so hard words (both for the confidence and for the bitterness of them) and so soft Arguments: but seeing his Weapons are so blunt, be doth well to put to the more strength. *If the Church (saith he) did not use it from the days of the Apostles we desire to know when it began.* *A.* This is iniquum postulatum: Nor are we obliged to pitch on the precise time of its beginning: Both because of the obscurity and defectiveness of the History of the first Ages of the Church; and because most of these Superstitions had no solemn, or observable beginning, to be universally used; but crept in by degrees: Being first used by some Churches and after by more: And being first an Embrio, and in procees of time, lickt into the form that they now have. Again, we can prove, by the silence, both of Scripture, and of other Church History, that this Festival was not used for three hundred years after Christ, and a notable confirmation of this Argument may be taken from the notice that is taken of Easter in these times; and not a word of *Christmass*. The reason was, because many of the Christians were very tenacious of the old *Jewish Customs* (one of which the observation of Easter was) but had not then begun to devise new Holy days of their own. *Cens. Madg. 7. ca. 6. p. 136 edit Basil 1564. De festis aliis prater pascha, pentecosten, & diem Dominicum neque in Asianarum, neque in Africanarum Ecclesiarum Historiis aliud quicquam reperies. Spanhemius Epitom. 11. sag. ad Hist. nov. Test. Sac. 2. sect. 4. pag. 30. Cith Valejus, confessing nec omnes nec ubique Christianos convenire solitos aliis diebus prater Dominicam. And Sac. 3. sect. 4. p. 364. Festi dies (inquit) nondum alii Christiani ex Terulliano, Origine, & genuinis monumentis, prater Dominicam, pascha & pentecosten. The first mention which that diligent Searcher into Antiquity findeth of Christmass is, Sac. 4. sect. 4. p. 404. Festum (inquit) Theopbania, vel Epiphanias, id est. Nativitatis Christi, celebratum nunc omnibus ecclesiis orientis ad 6 Januarii festis Epiphan. in occidentali vero ecclesia ad 25 Decembris, qui mos, circa aetatem Chrylosomi in oriente quoque obtinere capis, ex ejus homilia in die Nativ. 10. 5. And it is observable, how faintly Spondanus, the Epitimator of Baronius, speaketh of this observation; anno Christi 58. Sect. 36. Apostolici viri reliqua festa addiderunt (viz. besides the Lord's day) but bringeth no Vouchers for what he saith, but *Augusti*. and *Fausius* in whose time we deny not that many of the Holy days were in use: He addeth, *Quamvis hac ipsa ab Apostolis instituta & legatur in qualiscunque auctoritatis constitutionibus Clementis, & praecedat.* In Scotland this Festival was not observed till after *Palladius* had brought in *Bishops*. A grave Author informeth us, that it began in King *Arthur's* time; about 521 when he wintered at *York*, they thought fit to put off the Melancholy time of Winter in Feasting and Mirth: Which is the Celebration of *Yule* that is most observable at this day. And even when the Holy days were observed, the Church bound no man to that observation: As the *Magdeb*. shews out of *Socras. Hist. Eccl. lib. 5.**

§. 33. Our Author goeth on in his proofs. And (saith he) *tho' it had not been from the beginning, the Christian Church may continue the practice of it, on the best Reasons.* When we hear these Reasons, we shall consider them; but instead of them he diverteth into answering an objection. If he can shew good Reason (much more if he bring the best Reason) why the Church should either begin or continue this Solemnity, we shall cheerfully yield the Cause. The objection he taketh notice of is, *It is asked (saith he) if our Saviour was born on the 25 of December.* His answer is, *This is Childish and Impertinent;* and pleadeth, that it was not needful to determine whether it was the day of Christs Nativity. Against this *Largue first*; Was it ever heard of, that the Birth day of any person was kept

but on the day on which the Person was born. Will this Author say, that it is in the power of the Church to appoint any day in the year for this Commemoration, as she may certainly do, if she did appoint December 25 at first? They who plead for Anniversary Holy days, use to reason with more apparent Cogency; that the providence of God by chusing such a particular day for some eminent work, such as the Birth of Christ, doth lay a Foundation for the Churches setting apart that day for commemorating that work. So *Honker Eccles. Polit. lib. 5. § 69. Christ's extraordinary works (saith he) have sanctified some times, and advanced them, so that they ought to be, with all Men that honour God, more holy then other times.* And afterward, *as Christ's extraordinary presence sanctified some places, so his extraordinary works sanctified some times.* And if so, the Church in chusing another day, doth act without Warrant, and Arbitrarily; as she doth also absurdly, in neglecting the day that was so signalized. And it is, at least, a probable Argument, that the Lord would not have a recurrent particular day, observed on the account of Christ's Birth; in that he hath concealed from us what day it was, on which Christ was born. He hath instituted, that the day of the Week on which our Lord rose from the dead, should be kept holy; and therefore hath not left us to guess what day he rose upon; but expressly told us that he rose the first day of the Week. Another objection he answereth is, the *Vindicator* thinks that such an Anniversary day is not to be kept by Gods appointments. His answer is, *Hath not God appointed us to obey the Apostles, and their Successors, our lawful Ecclesiastical Rulers, to the end of the World? Here is shuffling with a witness: The Apostles, and they whom he is pleased to call their Successors, are confusedly put together, to hide the nakedness of his Answer.* I confess we are commanded to obey the *Apostles*, because they were infallibly guided: And so their Commands are the Commands of Christ; but I deny the *Apostles* instituted the Holy days that he pleadeth for: For their Successors (real or pretended) I deny that we are commanded to obey them farther than they bring Divine Warrant, (either positive, by Institution, or natural) for what they teach, or enjoyn. It is pleasant to observe, that our Learned *Apologists* are forced to use the same Argument for *Christmas*, that the *Papists* use for blind Obedience to all that their Church enjoyneth. For farther answer, he asketh, *May not they order the publick Solemnities, and Returns of Gods Worship.* A. If by ordering, he meaneth determining the Circumstances that are needful to be determined, and are not determined in Scripture; we grant they may: Such as appointing what hour we should meet for publick Worship: or what day to meet for Fasting, or Thanksgiving, when providence doth, in a special manner, call to that Work: But if he mean, that they may appoint days not appointed by the Lord, to be perpetually recurrent; we say they may not: Because we see no such power granted to the Church: And this were a Power to make some days so Holy, as they could never be applied to civil use: Such discrimination of days the Lord hath reserved in his own hand.

§. 34. That this Regulation hath a tendency to preserve and propagate the great Truths of the N. T. is neither true (it is often teen to have the contrary effect) to propagate Prophaneism and Atheism nor can it infer any thing to our purpose: for it is not the natural tendency of a thing, but the Institution of Christ, and his blessing following on that, which can make any thing conducive to Religious ends: We must preserve and propagate Christs truths by his own means; not by Mens devices. He telleth us, *if all Ecclesiastical Constitutions had been written in the Bible they could not have been read in a thousand years: And that either immediate revelations behoved to be continued, or the ordering of publick Solemnities must be left to Reason.* A. The distinction above used doth take off the strength of this Argument: Ordering all Circumstances could not be written, they are to various, therefore they are left to Reason; but perpetual sequestering a day from Civil use, is more than a Circumstance: And surely a short Chapter in the N. T. might have contained all the Holy days that the *Papish*, or *Bishopal* Party have thought fit to make universally binding to all Christians; as the 23d. chap. of *Leviticus* containeth all that the *Jews* were obliged to observe. The *Vindicator* is severely lashed p. 40. *Sub finem*, For bringing a Latine Sentence (tho' out of *Augustine*) to excuse from not observing any Holy days, save what are enjoyned in Scripture: *Atiq* (saith the *Apologist*) *Nonsense could change its nature by being put into Latine.* It seems we poor Mortals may not meddle with Latine; himself

and some others have the Monopoly of it, and often he bringeth Latin Citations out of Authors left to be regarded than the excellent *Augustine*: If we cite a Greek Author out of a Latine Translation, that offended him p. 35. And now when *Augustine* is cited in the Language he wrote in, here is still matter of quarrell. We know not how to please him, and the ordinary effect of such difficulty is, to make one regardless of pleasing them who are so humourous. If this Sentence be *Nonsense*, either in it self, or as applied. *Augustine* must answer for it: For he useth it to the same purpose. But the *Nonsense* lieth in this: *The question is not* (saith the *Apologist*) *about Articles of Faith, but concerning the Constitutions of the Universal Church*: If it might be said, without provoking him to the *Indecencies of Passion*, it is *Nonsense* indeed to apply this Sentence to the Articles of Faith; which are not the *Jassa* of Religion; but the observation of Holy days belongeth to that head if to any thing that can be called Religious. It is not a day being *Anniversary* (as he dreameth) that is the ground of our Scruple: For we do not disallow Anniversary days for any Civil work or Solemnity: But that Men should separate, by their own Authority, one day of the year from the rest, by sequestering it from Civil use (for which the Lord hath allowed us all the six days of the week) and dedicating it to Religious employment, we think this belongeth to God alone. It is a strange fancy that *Christmas*, and such days, are *needful for Educating our Posterity in that Faith which we believe*: As if Gods Ordinances were not sufficient for that end, without the addition of Mens devices. It is as wild an apprehension, that it is *Enthusiasm* to be against such days. I will not vilifie him so much as to question whether he understandeth what is *Enthusiasm*: (tho' he is not sparing in shewing such respect to others) but I hope it may be said, he did not consider what it is, when he put that *Epithete* on this Opinion; and on being for the *Jus divinum* of Presbytry. For we do not pretend to any knowledge in these, but what we build on Scripture, and Reason; we plead no immediate Revelation. If he can prove our Grounds to be insufficient, he may conclude our Opinions false; but not that they are *Enthusiastick*: All the Divines that I have read on that subject take *Enthusiasm* for a pretension to immediate Revelation, or Inspiration, or Instinct, or *Afflatus*, of things that they who pretend to it can give no other ground for: And even *Plutarch* calleth it *Insensibilis opinio: de defectu; Oracul. c. 67*. If he can either prove that we pretend to this, or that we bring no other grounds for what we affirm, let him brand us with *Enthusiasm* at his pleasure: That all the *subdivisions of Dissenters* in England are for *Anniversary Holy days*, is so well known to be false, that I wonder he should insinuate so much, without blushing. That the *Anniversary day* for the burning of London, is observed by them all with *Fasting and Prayer*, is not true, for any thing that I know. And if it were true, will be also say that they have sequestered that day from all Civil Employment, and dedicated it to Religion: If he say not this the Case is not parallel to what we now debate about.

§ 35. His conclusion of what he had discoursed is, That it is dangerous, if not impious, to separate from the Church, in those excellent Constitutions that are received from the beginning, and in all Countries, where the name of Jesus hath been worshipped: Such Constitutions and Solemnities have been derived from the Apostles, or Apostolick times. Here are big words: If the strength of his forgoing Reasons were but proportioned to the confidence of his Assertion; our Cause must fall to the ground. But the Reader will judge whether any one word of this *Thrasnick* triumph be true, or have sufficient foundation, in what he hath proved. He telleth us (but I know not to what purpose) that the knowledge of *Christ* doth not extinguish the light of Reason: Therefore such Constitutions (as the reason of all Mankind is agreed in) have nothing in them contrary to the purity of our Religion. It is tedious to relate, or to read such loose Arguings, of which the meanest Logician might be ashamed. We deny not the use of Reason in Religion, viz. For understanding what is revealed, and for drawing Native Consequents from these great truths: But that the use of Reason is to appoint new Ordinances, or Means of Grace, that *Christ* hath not appointed, we deny. And if our Author do not assert that, he saith nothing for his Holy days: And if he do not prove it, his Argument is insignificant. For Holy days are such means, if we may believe this Author, who speaketh of them as the means of propagating the Christian Faith. That these Constitutions are agreed on by all Mankind, is a supposition as far from Truth,

Truth, and from Modesty, as any thing can be. He hath not yet done with this subject, but falleth on it afresh, in a discourse two pages long; which he calleth a *short digression*: Wherein any thing that looketh like Argumentation hath been, many times, to far greater advantage, propoed by others of his way; and as often answered by Men of our side: So that I wonder that so high a pretender, is not ashamed so to trifle: Some things indeed he hath that are new, viz. Some Historical passages which are as far remote from Truth, as Darknes is from Light. Let us hear the particulars: He pleaderh p. 41. that Anniversary Solemnities may be used in the Worship of God; tho' they have been abused to the Worship of Idols: *A. We have better Arguments against these, and other Human Ceremonies, than from the abuse of them by Papists, and Pagans*: But even this wanteth not its weight, only we never used this Argument against the use of things necessary; and therefore the Author doth unwisely mention the *Sun* and the *Seasons*; the use of which we must not lay aside, who ever abuse them: But of things that are of no necessity; such as all Human Ceremonies are acknowledged to be, by the most Learned of the Patrons of them. Our Argument hath yet greater strength, if we consider, not only that the Holy day now debated about was kept by the *Heathens*, in Honour of *Julius Caesar*; and hence called *Yule* in Scotland: And is still abused by many Superstitious Fop-pies among the *Papists*: But is generally, by the far greater part of the *Protestant* Observers of it, spent in Idleness, Feasting, and Playing; and by very many, it is horribly profaned by all manner of Excess and Debaucheries. It is a wonderful confidence: *Do we not see (saith he) all Nations agree in this, that Publick Solemnities and Anniversary Festivities, and Fasts, are necessary to the Being, and Beauty of Religion*: So p. 41. and p. 42. we ought to remember that the *stated Festivals, and Fasts, of the Church, do preserve, and increase our Mortification*. *ibid. The stated periods of Fasting oblige the most stubborn, and impenitent to think of his Soul; and the visible practices of the Church preach Repentance, more effectually, and make more lasting impressions, then the loose and indefinite Homilies of Self concealed Men*. And p. 43. he imputeth to the neglect of Fasting among *Protestants, the hindrance of the Reformation of the Grecian Churches*. And *ibid. The publick seasons of Devotions are the Catechism of the People*. A few Remarks, to expose these flights of his Fancy. First, What could be more said of the Word and Sacraments, and other Ordinances instituted by Christ? What greater Elogies are given to them in Scripture? For indeed he saith as much as *Christmasts* and other Holy dayes, are the *power of God to Salvation*. 2. This is contrary to the Sentiments of all that ever wrote on this subject: Who agree, that these Ceremonies are indifferent things: And yet he will have them necessary, and that not only to the beauty of Religion, but to the being of it. 3. Then it seems there was no Religion in the *Apostolick Church*; nor among the *Waldenses*; nor in *Geneva*; and several other Reformed Churches: I add not the *Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, in all the Ages of it; because he will hardly allow any thing of Religion to be among us. This is his *Christian Charity*, of which he talketh: He doth indeed damn all them to Hell who observe not *Christmasts*. He is the first of this Opinion, and I hope he shall be the last. 4. If all this were true, it were impossible that Irreligion, Impenitency, or Immorality, could be (at least, be frequent, and abundant) in a Church where these forms are used: Which I hope none will say, who have lived in *England*, or in *Scotland*, or in the *Romane Communion*. It is but suitable to his *Genius* to vilifie the Preaching of *Presbyterians, as the loose and indefinite Homilies of Self concealed Men*: But it had been fit to have told us whether there be any Preaching that can equal these forms, in efficacious working on the Soul. If this be not what the *Pharisees* are reproved for; making void *Christ's Ordinances for Mens Traditions*; I know not what can be so represented. 5. If the neglect of Fasting among *Protestants*, hinder the Reformation of the *Greek Churches*, why doth not the frequent Fasts in the *Papish Church* (with which they have more occasion to converse than with *Protestants*) contribute to advance that Reformation. 6. Seeing he is pleased to digress from *Feasting* to *Fasting*; he might know, that real *Fasting* used to be more frequent among the *Presbyterians* than among the *Prelatis*; for their *set Fasts of Lent and Good Friday*, how few among them do observe them?..

§. 36. He telleth us next, of *Anniversary Holy days among the Jews, besides these which God appointed; and yet not reprov'd* p. 41. and 42. and he instanceth in the Fasts mentioned, *Zech. 7.* and *the Feast of the Dedication at which Christ was present, Joh. 10. 22.* That these Fasts were not reprov'd, is said without all warrant: God disowneth them; if he say they were only disowned, on account of the neglect of seriousness in managing them, this must be prov'd. Again, Christ, and the Prophets, had to many things of greater moment to reprove and insist particularly upon, that they contented themselves to comprehend such things as these, under general reproofs, which were not wanting; and might, by a thinking Man, be apply'd to all such Observations: As when *Jeroboam* is reprov'd for devising Holy days that God had not appointed, *1 Kings 12. 33.* And Christ condemneth Humane Devices in Worship, *Mat. 15. 9.* And the Prophet's condemn'd some Worship that was in it self most abominable, on account that it was *not commanded*, *Jer. 7. 31.* Christ's presence at the *Feast of Dedication* was no more, but his walking in the Temple, while the People were Celebrating that Feast: Which can no ways be strained to signify either Joyning, or Approbation. He talketh of *Shaking off all Externals of Religion*, p. 42. and calleth it the *Error of Dissenters*. That is palpably false: We have the External administration of the Word, and Sacraments among us: But it seems he will not only have his Humane Devices to make a great Figure in External Religion, but to be the ALL of it. Such loose talk is unbecoming a Divine. That which followeth, is an odd fancy: *It is certain that nothing preserveth the knowledge of Christian Religion among the body of the People, more than the Festivals of the Church.* What? Not the Word and Sacraments? Whether this looketh rather like *raving*, than like *disputing*, let the Reader judge. He saith also, that *we teach the People to despise all Forms*: That is false; we keep the form of Baptizing, and Celebrating the Lords Supper, that we find in the Scripture. It is another horrid Falsehood (and I know not how it could fall from one who hath regard to the God of Truth) that *it is rare to find a Presbyterian Child in the West of Scotland who can repeat the Commandments, or the Creed*, and he complaineth; that by this means, *Atheism* is promoted, and that the *Clowns* laugh when a *Curate* recommendeth to their Children, the Creed, the Lords Prayer, and the ten Commandments. None are more careful to instruct their Children, in these, and other Principles of Religion, than *Presbyterian* Parents are; both in the West, and other places. And it is the constant practice of Ministers when they Catechise the People, to examine them on all these three; and to require the People to get them by heart; and to make them understand them. It is also false, that *we have no Opinion of a Mans understanding, unless he entertain us with discourses of Gods unsearchable decrees*. These are very seldom the Subject of our Preaching. But it is beyond all his other reproaches, that he imputeth to *Presbyterians*, that they *Preach Justification before Conversion*. I know not a *Presbyterian* in Scotland that is of that Opinion. If sometimes Ministers instruct their People how the *Convictions of Natural Conscience may be distinguished from the Convictions that proceed from the Spirit of God*. I think that is not to be expos'd to ridicule, nor made a reproach by any who is acquainted with the deceit of the Heart, and the danger of delusion about the truth of Grace in the Soul. What he discourseth p. 43. of the *ancient Discipline of the Church*, being conducive to Reformation; I heartily close with: But am far from thinking, that that Discipline lay in *Festivities or Fasts*, appointed by Men, but in censuring of Sin according to the appointment of Christ.

§. 37. He beginneth a new head p. 43. near the end which is a large discourse about the *Schism* that he alledgeth the *Presbyterians* to be guilty of. And all this he foundeth on a word, occasionally, and transiently, written by the *Vindicator* (if our Author cite his words true, which we cannot know, seeing he doth not direct us) viz. *That he knoweth no Schism but such as was caus'd by his Opposites*. If I knew on what occasion this was said, I could the better judge whether it was well said, or not: But he hath left us here (as often elsewhere) to guess; as he also citeth Scriptures without Chapter or Verse. And it is not easie to find out one short Sentence, which may be hath no more joyn'd to it on that Subject in a large Book: Before I consider his Relations of this Assertion, I shall shew, in what sense this may be maintain'd, 1. In England the *Presbyterians* are not guilty of Schism, nor do they desert

sest the Church; but are driven away by Her; because she Excommunicateth them, unless they will practise some Ceremonies that they cannot use, with a good Conscience: This hath been proved against Bishop *Stillingfleet*, *Rational Defence of Nonconformity*. And if our Author please to debate his Reasons shall be considered. 2. In *Scotland* the *Presbyterians*, who had freedom to hear the Conformists, and yet had Meetings wherein they heard their own Ministers, who were unjustly Excommunicated, could not be guilty of sinful Separation: Because they still owned the *Episcopal Church of Scotland* as a True, tho' Corrupted Church, and did not thin to partake in the Ordinances with Her, but were under no obligation to cast off their own Ministers who were orderly called and sett'd among them, and not removed from them by any Church Authority; but only by the Civil Power, which however it might forcibly hinder the publick exercise of a Mans Ministry) could neither make him no Minister, nor not the Minister of that People: And these *Presbyterian Ministers* and People, were ately not only by the Gospel, but by the Law, the Church of *Scotland*; and the ceasing of their Legal Right by the change of the Law, could not take away their Gospel Right: And any thing that might look like Separation, was caused by our Opposites, in that they had violently thrust us from our Places. 3. Even they who did so separate from the *Episcopal Church of Scotland*, as to deny all Communion with her, and to refuse to joyn with Her, in any Ordinances, could be charged with no Separation, but what was caused by our Opposites: For their overturning the settled, and found Church of *Scotland*, and driving away the Pastors that those Persons could freely hear, did tempt them to this Course: Tho' I do not approve of their Principle of not Hearing; yet the blame lay not only on them, but on them who had driven them on this precipice.

§. 38. Let us now hear with what weighty Arguments he will refute the Assertion, that he levelled his Discourse against: A great part of his Discourse is not fit to be answered; such as, That the *Universal Church is not to strike Sail to the Novelties of Upstarts*, p. 43. This is true, but wholly Impertinent: Unless he can prove that the *Scottish Episcopalians* are either the Universal Church, or in this maintained the Cause of the Universal Church: And that *Presbyterians* are Upstarts: Which we maintain have been since the Apostolic days: And were in *Scotland*, since the Reformation from Popery, and before the entrance of Popery: But of this after: That by our *Baptismal Vow* we are bound to keep the Unity of the Catholic Church; we willingly confess: But at the same time, we affirm, that the same Vow obligeth us, not to tempt others to break it. His Arguments to prove the *Presbyterians* of *Scotland* Separatists have this general fault; that they touch not the Conclusion: Nor contradict the Assertion that he would refute: For if I thou'd grant them to be Separatists; yet this Separation may be culpably caused by our Opposites. They have also another Fault; that they make no distinction of the Separation (on whose side soever the Crime of it was) between one sort of *Presbyterians* and another: Whereas it is certain, that some did live in the Communion of that Church (tho' they did not approve of all her ways) and others did not. His first Argument is p. 44. They separate from all Churches Ancient and Modern: Nor is there a Church on Earth, with which they can Communicate, without fear of being polluted. This is false: None of us refused to Communicate with the Churches of *Holland*, *France* (when they had liberty) *Geneva*; and many others: But many of us, did cheerfully Communicate with them. His proof of this Assertion is, all other Churches have some things we dislike. This is not conclusive, for we never thought it unlawful to Communicate with a Church which was not as pure as we could wish: What we dislike in any, we abstain from the practice, or approbation of it, but do not for that, deny Communion with the Church, where it is found. He again argueth, p. 44. and 45. That the former *Presbyterians* did not separate from the publick Worship in the *Episcopal Church*. 2. Neither did all the present *Presbyterians*; and they who did were tempted, yea driven, into that Course, by his *Unhappy Apostacy*, and overturning the settlement of the Church, by force, without either any Act of Church Authority, or endeavour to satisfy the Consciences of the People. I do not approve, more than he doth, of all that is contained in the *Apological Relation*. That *Presbyterian Ministers* made use of the Lords Prayer, we deny not; nor did we ever condemn it. The same we say of using the *Cross* in Baptism: Nor did we

ever separate from the Church on these grounds: For the *Doxology*, we know it was used, but I know no warrant for the constant use of it, when the several parts of the Songs composed by the Spirit of God, to be Sung in the Church, were more seldom used. It seemeth to be too great deference to humane compulfore, and therefore we think it is better to lay it aside. For the *Apostolical Benediction*, we have Scripture Examples for it, which is sufficient warrant: If he can bring the same for these that he calleth *Christian Forms*, we shall use them. It is our Authors brain to talk high on slender Grounds, that the use of these Forms is the Spirit and Practice of the Church: and that too the Canonical and Universal Methods of the Church are tempered with regard to our Infirmities; yet they (the Presbyterians) love to sit in the face of their Mother. We deny the Episcopal or Popish Church to be our Mother, and we deny these forms to be imposed (at least perpetually and universally) by the Catholic Church: So as we lie never in the face of our Mother, by disusing them. After he had taken notice of the distinction of occasional and fixed Communion, p. 44. he saith on it again p. 46. His Argument against it is *Why may not that fixedly be done which may occasionally, since the common ties of Christianity obliges us?* A. That there are ties on us to Communion with the Episcopal Congregations, we deny; and what may be pretended in favour of such obligation, is above answered. The Reason that he asketh, is plain, because I may have other obligations which hinder me to do that constantly, which I may do sometimes: I may lawfully Preach in another Mans Pulpit, when he calleth me to it, but it is not fit I should do it fixedly, and desert mine own.

§. 39. His 2d. Argument, to prove us all Schismatics is, *If they had lived (saith he) fifty years before the first Council of Nice, they behoved to have separated:* For then were practised by the Universal Church, all these things they scruple at; many things he nameth: Here were a large Field for Disputation, if he had proved what he saith, but that he confidently asserteth, and we confidently deny: That the Hierarchy was then in the Church: However some of the Names might be; the Church Power and Dominion, that now is signified by them, was not then in being. Argument 3d. is from the Doctrine and Practice of our Predecessors, which he used before, and I did answer before. Arg. 4th. He requirerh us to name any Schismatics, in ancient History, to whom that name is more agreeable, than to Presbyterians: If this can be done he is mistaken; The strength of this Argument seemeth to be in his Infallibility: Certainly if we be not the worst Men of the World, he is mistaken. The Donatists separated from the Church, because she admitted the lapsd on their Repentance; and cast off their lawful Pastors, and all Communion with the Church: we do not cast off all Communion with the Church, nor reject our Pastors, but cleave to them, rather than to Intruders. Arg. 5th. Cyprian's notion of Schism is, *when one separateth from his own Bishop:* This the Presbyterians do: Ergo. A. All the strength of this Argument lieth in the sound of words: A Bishop, in Cyprian's time, was not a *Diocesan*, with sole Power of Jurisdiction and Ordination; if he prayeth, we shall give Cyprian, and him leave to call us Schismatics. A Bishop then was the Pastor of a Flock, or the Moderator of a Presbytery, if he can prove that we separate from our Pastors, or from the Presbytery, with their Moderator, under whose Inspection we ought to be, let him call us what he will. But we disown the Bishops in Seculars from being our Bishops: We can neither own their Episcopal Authority, nor any Pastoral Relation that they have to us.

§. 40. The next Controversie in Divinity that he undertaketh to manage is about Preaching Morality: p. 47. He chargerh the *Antidoteur* with censuring the Clergy for preaching Morality: And cherh his p. 62. and p. 67. And in his Remonstration to this Impuration, he is pleased to treat his Adversary with a parcel of harsh words, such as *Spice* and *All Nature* p. 48. *an itching plague*, and *little sobriety* p. 49. This *unjust* Accusation, said: *Thine another stroke of his Good Nature and Credulity.* All which he pass: For the Reader will, by comparing what is said by him, and me, (especially in this place) easily find, whether of us do best deserve these Epithets. What I have to say in answer to this charge is, that there is no truth in what he saith: But on the contrary, there is a double falsehood in it. One is that this censure is passed on the Clergy: I know some of them Preach the Gospel soundly, and usefully: what is said is evidently aimed at the Writer of this Pamphlet, and some others who

are of his Kidney: In whose Discourses little of the *Righteousness of Christ* and that *Strength and Assistance from Him*, by which we must obey His Laws, is to be found. Another halfbood is, that any Man is censured for *Preaching Morality*. That which is taken notice of is, that some do so preach *Morality*, as to neglect that which is *Divinity*: That is, so to Preach the Duties that are required of us, as not to open to People the mystery of Christ, and Salvation by him: In shewing them that we can do nothing that is acceptable to God without an interest in Christ as our Righteousness; and without the aid of his Spirit. It is our daily work to Preach *Morality*, and the necessity of *Holiness* is all manner of *Conversations*: But we look on this, as at the half of Gospel Preaching: And that, even when we press a Holy Life, and particular Duties, on these excellent Motives taken out of the Scripture, which he, at great length, insisteth on, about which I am far from controverting with him: Only I must tell him, that the Gospel, which we must Preach, and by which we look for Salvation, is not only *Morality*, even *Christian*, let be *Pagan*; which he describeth to be *Evangelical Obedience and Holiness*, without which no man shall see God (tho' that be an essential part of it) but it comprehendeth also knowledge of, and Faith in *Jesus Christ*, as our Righteousness and Strength: Of which there is little in the Sermons of some of his Party: And not a word, in his long Discourse on this Head; tho' it be designed to shew how fully they Preach the Gospel: And I still affirm, that this is not that *Devotism*, that Christ and his Apostles taught: And I hope the Reader may, by this time see that there is no nicety in distinguishing between his *Christian Morality* and the *Christian Divinity* that Ministers should Preach. He saith, p. 48. That there are no Socinians among the *Episcopal Clergy* of Scotland: In which I do not contradict him: For I know them not; but if he has said there are no *Seminarizing Arminians*; I could have made the contrary appear. He is angry with the *Vindicator*, p. 50 that he saith, *May be we understand what the Pagan Philosophy is as well as our Neighbours*: But we shall not quarrel with him, tho' p. 49 he saith, *May be we have read Seneca with as much attention as he did, and can give as good accounts of the defects of the Stoical Philosophy*. I do not envy his Learning, and I do not pretend to have any such degree of it, that may provoke others to envy. He defendeth, p. 50. an Argument used for the Orthodoxy of the Clergy: That they could sign the 39 Articles of the Church of England: And is displeased that it is objected, that some do so, who yet preach against what they have signed. I hope this is no judging of Men's Hearts, as he wisely commenteth on it; but of the Inconsistency of two overt acts: Neither is it a refutation of this, that the Clergy cannot, by hardships, now be brought to comply with the *Presbyterians*: For some of them are more yielding, and others are more fixt in their way; which may be imputed to Conscience in some, and in others, to other Motives.

§. 41. What he next chargeth on his Adversary, p. 51 is a Censure on the Author whom he is Re-
probating; who insinuateth that the *Presbyterians* talk every day to the People of Gods Decrees and Re-
probation; by denying this to be the practice of *Prelatists*. And it is answered by the *Vindicator*, that
this is impertinent, if he mean as he expresseth it: For who (saith the *Vindicator*) ever blamed any Man
arbitrarily, because he insisted not always on such subjects? The *Apologist* hath represented this as if
it had been expressed, that we do not require that one should always talk of Decrees and Reprobations.
I know no Design in using such senseless expressions, but to expose his Opposite as Ridiculous:
Whereas these silly expressions are his own: The *Vindicator's* words are these abovementioned. He
retracteth also this passage, as what sheweth little Skill in Logic; because, every day, doth not im-
ply doing nothing else. I answer, neither doth always signify so much: What was asserted is, that
Presbyterians do not only, nor preach constantly on these subjects; but that they do it not frequently;
which he himself alloweth, as the signification of every day. The fault that he next findeth, with the
Vindicator, is of more moment, it is that, p. 55. he speaketh of the absolute Decrees of Election
and Reprobation, both *preteritum & predamnatum*: He be it unpeeh, and trampleth on a *Adver-*
ry; and he alloweth of *preteritum* his rude *predamnatum* but not *decreum preteritum & predamnatum*.
I confess here he hath more seeming advantage, than any where else: Neither can I blame any thing
in his observation, save his defect in Candor and Charity: For no doubt there is in these expressi-
ons,

ons, as he observeth, *complicated Nonsense and Blasphemy*: But the best is, it is purely an Error of the Press, not of the Author; which any Man might have observed who readeth the passage without *εὐχρηστικῶς*. I do solemnly declare (and I hope some will believe me, tho' I hardly expect such Charity from this Author, considering what diminutive thoughts he hath elsewhere exprest of my Morality as well as understanding) that I never thought so, that I never spoke so, that I never wrote so: The words in my Manuscript are *Præterition*, and *Prædemonstration*.

§. 42. Another Theological debate (or Historical, about a Theological head) he beginneth, p. 52. where he leaveth the *second Vindication*, and picketh occasion of this quarrel with his Antagonist, out of the first. What he insinuateth against is, the *Vindicator* had asserted that the Church of Scotland, before Popery entered into it, and in the first time of its being Christian, was not governed by *Bishops*; but by the Pastors of the Church (then called *Caldees*) acting in Parity. This he alloweth to be of some consideration; not for any Historical Truth that is in it, but because the Learned *Blondel* made use of it: Yet he calleth it an *imaginary Hypothesis*: And laboureth to run it down (after his wont) with very severe words: As if he would Heff us out of our Principles: What is the strength of his Arguments we shall try. To vilifie *Blondel's* Authority: He telleth us that he met it in *Buchanan*, and that that Learned Historian took it from his contemporary *Monks*, *Boetius* and others. This is either from our *Apologists* superficial reading of what he would refuse, or not reading it, but taking it on trust, or dissingenuity, in concealing what was needful to set the matter before the Reader, in its true light. For *Blondel*, *Apolog. pro sententia Hieron* p. 314, 315. Citeth *Fordon*, *Joan. Major* & *Boet.* Wherefore he took it not from *Buchanan* alone: It is also an odd blunder to say that *Boetius* and the others that *Buchanan* had it from, were his contemporary *Monks*. For *Boetius* and *Major*, were not *Monks* nor were they contemporary with *Buchanan*: And *Fordon* was far removed from his time: Nor did any two of these mentioned live at the same time. He doth also deal unfairly, and not as a Disputant, with the *Vindicator*; for he taketh no notice of what grounds he brought for what he affirmed, viz. That *Palladius* was the first *Bishop* in Scotland; and yet Christianity was publicly professed in it, above three hundred years before his time: This is proved out of *Baronius*, *Spoudanus*, *Beda*, and others: But it was his wisdom to take no notice of this. His first and chief Argument against our Assertion is, there were none that lived near that Age who writeth the History of it, and the *Monks* who wrote any thing were extremely ignorant: Wherefore this story of the *Caldees* ruling the Church, hath no Credibility. This is the substance of what he discourseth at length, p. 52, 53. In answer to which. 1. This is at one blow to raze the Foundation of the History of our Nation; and of that of most others: And to make them all to be Fools who have enquired into these Antiquities that concern our Nation, and others: Such as *Fordon*, *Major*, *Beda*, *Usher*, &c. Yea, *Baronius*, the *Centuriatores* of *Magdeburgh*, and such famous Historians, have spent their time in vain, if this new Judge of Learning may be heard. 2. he might have taken notice, that *Prosper* was cited, out of *Spoudanus*, by his Antagonist: And he wrote about the year 420. not far from the time that he telleth us *Palladius* was made the first *Bishop* of Scotland. It is ridiculous to talk of the *Acts of the Assemblies*, in that ancient period, p. 53. For we do not assert (as is expressly said, first *Vind.* p. 4.) that they had all the same modes of Presbyterian Government which we now have: That they had no *Bishops*, but that they had equal power in governing the Church, is all that we aim at; which is not disproved by such silly mocking, as this is. He telleth, *ibid.* of his Opinion, if he dare interpose it, that the *Monks* advanced this Fable to gratify the *Pope* in his design of keeping the *Bishops* low: And yet with the same Breath; this is so known, that it needeth neither proof, nor illustration: How to reconcile this timidity, and this confidence, is beyond my Capacity.

§. 43. Another thing like Argument is, p. 54. All the known Records of the Christian Church unanimously declare for the Hierarchy in the 2d. and 3d. Centuries. A. 2. This is denied, and the contrary hath been proved: It is too much confidence to assert this, till our Author take time to answer all that the Learned *Blondel*, and many others, have written. 2. Do any of these known Records speak of a Hierarchy in the Christian Church of Scotland? If they do not, this Argument mistaketh

in conclusion, that it should lead us to: For our present debate is, what Church Government was in Scotland about the 2d and 3d Centuries. What followeth is built on the same bottom; and falleth by the answer already given: Had Scotland (saith he) any other Church Government than what was received in the Christian Church when they were Converted? It is said that no parallel instance can be given. He here still supposeth that which he knoweth we debate against the Prelatists; which is no good way of Arguing. Let him read *Blondell* from the beginning to the end, and he shall find instances in all the Christian Churches, in *Asia*, *Europe*, and *Africa*. He should have answered all that he hath written in his *Apology*, before he had complained that no instance can be given of a Christian Church without a *Hierarchy*. It is still to the same purpose, when he asketh, by whom were they (the Scots) Converted? Is it not reasonable to think, that they who Converted them would plant that Church Government among them that they were acquainted with themselves? *A*. If he can prove that they were Converted by Prelatists, or Prelats, he gaineth what is now in debate. *Spontanous* out of *Prosper*, saith that *Palladius* was the first Bishop, who came among them: And *Baronius* sheweth, that they were Converted some Centuries before his time: As was shewed in the very place our Author pretendeth to refute. It is a great mistake in our Author, p. 54. That we appear with our *Guldees* against the undoubted Records of *Fathers*, *Councils*, &c. For these Records have been examined, and found not to be so undoubtedly on his side; But this he hath a mind to suppose. Again, we bring not the *Caldees*, or their Authority, for proving what we say: It is the Testimony of others concerning them. Beside all this, the *Fathers*, *Councils*, &c. say nothing of the Church Government of Scotland, in the first Ages of its Christianity; which is the thing now in debate. His last effort, under this head, is, *As he confesses there were some Priests in Scotland before Bishops, yet those had their Ordination, and Mission from Bishops in other places, in whom they might give account of their Travels, and Success: And this was ordinary before Nations were Converted, but when they received the Faith, then were Bishops, &c. placed among them.* *A*. This doth no way meet with the case in hand, for it is proved *sup. Vindic.* p. 4. 5. That not only some were become Christians, but the Kings of Scotland, and the body of the People had received the Christian Faith, upward of three hundred years before *Palladius*, the first Bishop came among them: Did they all this time continue not an Organical Church; and without Church Officers, and Government; I hope his confidence, as high as it flies, will not reach this far.

§ 44. The Author of the *History of the General Assembly* had not only spoke without Reverence, but with insolent Contempt, of Mr. *Gray's Sermons*, which are very savoury to many serious Souls. And the *Vindicator* made no farther remark on this, but, he sheweth his Skill in the affairs of Grace in the Soul: And this our Author calleth running him down: He loveth to speak big words when the sense of them is very small. I hope they who are indeed concerned about their Soul's Case, will find more of the Marrow of the Gospel in these Sermons, than in many of the flanting and starchy Discourses that this Author commendeth. This lofty Soul is next (p. 55.) displeased with the *Vindicator's* creeping Genius, because he discourseth of the *Act of the Assembly against the private administration of Baptism*: And calleth this, one of his little Impertinencies. By this means he reproacheth greater Men than that Author ever pretended to be: For that Controversie is not new, nor of his invention: And however little it be, it is none of his Impertinencies; but of his Adversaries, who reproacheth the *General Assembly* for it: Is it Impertinency to answer what an Antagonist doth object; or is it such to call such Conduct by that name? Let us now see how pertinent his Refutation of this our Principle is. He telleth, very Magisterially, that the *Assembly had done better to have left it to the discretion of Ministers in all places*. But with his permission, we think, that when abuses creep into the Church, about the administration of Christs Ordinances, they should be restrained by the determination of the Church: He will not say, it is from a creeping Genius, that some Men make Church Canons about Church Mens Cloaths, of what fashion they must be, on the Street and in the Pulpit, yea, when they ride abroad; (see Canon 74. of the Convocation, 1603, which standeth in force to this day) as if it were the work of a Convocation to write a Directory for Taylors: And yet it is too mean for the Church to consider

how the Ordinances of the Gospel should be managed. He supposeth that we make it necessary, to a Sermon from a Text be Preached at Baptism, and that opening the nature and use of that Sacrament, is not enough. But in this he mistaketh the state of the Controversie; which is whether Baptism (when the other Ordinances of the Gospel can be had publicly) should be administered before the Congregation, or such of them as on due warning to the whole, do give their presence, or may be done in a Corner as People please. If he had said any thing against our Principle in this, it should have been considered. That he chargeth the Presbyterian Ministers and People with want of understanding the Phrase, *ex opere operato*, we misregard.

§. 45. The *Vindicator*, p. 174. had occasionally said, that we cannot with a good Conscience comply with Humane Ceremonies. And hence he commenceth another Theological Debate, p. 55. 56. 57. I shall therefore (without reflecting on his reproachful and mocking strain, in managing this Controversie) consider his Arguments: The 1. is p. 56. Solomon adviseth, to look to our feet when we come into the House of God; and Moses was enjoined to put off his Shoes, because the ground was holy: And was not this a significant Ceremony? Here is accurate Logick; and may become the highest fear in an University. We ought to obey what God commandeth: Ergo, We must observe what Man deviseth, and enjoyeth in Gods Worship. If putting off the Shoes and looking to the Feet, be designed as that which all must observe when they go to Church, why doth not our Author, and his Party observe it? And for keeping our Feet, mentioned Eccles. 5. 1. will our Author say that its meant of an External, significant Ceremony? All the Interpreters, that I can meet with, expound it of looking carefully to the frame and settings of our Soul. *Drus, ambulans circumspice. Gejras; est metaphorica peregrinantibus in tali via ubi facile est am errare aut labi. Castallo, gere te prudenter. Piscator. Cave ut impingas. id est pecces in obscuro cultu Dei. Mercer: Non puto hic externum intelligi precum modum sed externis internis notabantur, &c.* Mr. Mede maketh it an allusion to the disalcation used in the Eastern Countries, when they came into a Holy place; which he saith, was common: But how common it was among other Nations I know not: Only I know, it was not used among the Jews in the Temple, but that now under their Apostacy, I have seen him that officiaeth, put off his Shoes on some of their Holy days; and that only at the reading of the Law. Another Argument of equal strength, he useth *Sackcloth and Ashes* did among all Nations signify Grief and Sorrow; therefore in their Humiliation they were used to express their Remorse and Convictions. As before, why then do not the Prelatists use them Again, it doth not follow, this Ceremony was used in all Civil Mourning, and from that was used in Religion; Ergo, We should now use Ceremonies in Religion, which neither are instituted by Divine Authority, nor have Civil Custom to make them Decent. His Sarcastick Reproof that followeth, is out of the way; for we never Condemned Ceremonies, because they were significant, but think that none should be used that are insignificant. We condemn them because they are appointed by Men, to signify the Grace which the Lord hath not instituted them to represent; and consequently, hath not blessed them to confer, and that in his Worship, which should be ordered in all these things that are peculiar to it, only by his own direction. The Ceremony of lifting up the right hand in swearing an Oath, not only hath warrant from Scripture Example; but it is the Civil Custom of the Nation: Therefore it is no pertinent, to bring it as an Example of a Religious significant Ceremony; if he can shew us as much ground for the Ceremonies he pleadeth for, we shall consider the matter farther. If any intelligent and unbiassed Reader will say, that his Reasonings that follow do deserve an answer, it shall be given. They are: We ought to approach to God with all the decent marks of Distance, and Adoration: True Religion obligeth us to comply with the innocent Decencies of Mankind, and not to affect Singularity: Christ eat and drank with Publicans and Sinners. I am so short sighted as that I cannot see how it follows from any of these Topics, or from all of them in Conjunction, That it is lawful to use Religious, significant Ceremonies, of Humane Institution, in the Worship of God. He addeth, If the Ceremony be used by the Nation among whom we live, if they decently express our Reverence, or Humiliation; for no reason why they may not be used in the Worship of God. A. If he can prove, that they are so useful in Civil, and Solemn Actions, as that they acquire a Civil Decency, then are they not Religious Ceremonies.

monies; *id est*: peculiar to Religion; but are Civil Rites, tho' used in Religion: But this is not what we dispute about. I deny not that a Minister may Preach in a Gown, it being made decent, by Civil Custom, in several sorts of public Actions: But it is not so with a Surplice. The power of Superiors to determine Circumstances, is widely different from a Power to appoint Religious Ceremonies. What he saith against *Presbyterians sitting in time of Prayer*, hath no weight: They neither injoy it, nor do always practise it: And they find, that in Scripture, Sitting, Standing, Kneeling, Lying prostrate on the Ground, are all used: And none of them injoyed, nor forbidden: And therefore it is Superstition, in any who would tie us to any of these. He calleth us Foolish and Peevish; because we say, their Ceremonies are parts of Worship: But we prove them to be parts of Worship, (*viz*: Superstitious Worship) because they are appropriated to Religion, and designed to that end, for which Worship is appointed; *viz*: To give a peculiar Honour to God, which is not given by other Actions; or even by these parts of Worship, to which he owneeth them as *Appendages*. He blameth the *Vindicator*, for suggesting a Reason why some of the Clergy do now read the *Common Prayers*. And giveth, for the true Reason, an open avowing of their Principles, when it was visible to the World, that there was no uniting with the *Presbyterians*. Is this the Candor, with the want of which, he here loadeth his Antagonist? Is there less hope now, than before, of uniting with the *Presbyterians*: When the *General Assembly* hath published terms on which they will receive them; and such as can well be defended to be most rational; and on which, not a few of them have come in among us? Why did they not openly avow these Principles when they had Church power in their hand, and could have done it without any Cheik, and when they saw, by many proofs, that the *Presbyterians* would rather suffer the greatest hardships than be brought over to their way. If this be not *Palliating and Shuffling*, I know not what is to be so called. I have had much occasion to consider this Controversie about Ceremonies; and have read many on his side: But I never met with any of them who manageth it so slightly, nor do I think it fit to insist farther on it, at present then his Reasonings do necessarily require; if any thing were answered to them.

§ 46. He saileth next on the Letter appended to the 2d *Vindication*; and blameth the Author of it, for saying that *some of the Bishops being Re-ordained was a Scandal, not only to this, but to other Reformed Churches*. He denieth it to be a Scandal to the *Foreign Churches*; or the *French Divines*: All of them (saith he) the greatest Men among them, are Re-ordained when they come to England. Here is strong Reasoning: For first he maketh all the *Foreign Churches*, and *French Divines*, to be Equipollent, and Convertible Terms, which some Readers will smile at. 2. He falsely asserteth, that all the *French Divines* that came to England in this Persecution, were Re-ordained: The contrary is well known: It is true, all who got Places in England were Re-ordained: And it must needs be so; for none other could be allowed to injoy any Benefice: But many came to England who never were Re-ordained. How can it then be a Scandal to *Foreign Churches*, when they see their Ministers reckoned no Ministers, but initiated, the same way, into the Ministry, as they should, if they had never been Ordained: And consequently, all the *Papists* and other *Ordinances*, administered by them, to be reputed Null and Void, and on the matter, their Churches Unchurched. He instanceth only in *Monsieur Alix*, I doubt not but there were not a few others, whom either their strained Circumstances, or some other Principle did determine that way: For *Monsieur Alix*, there are other Sentiments of that Learned Man, which make many to judge his Example to be no conclusive Argument, That this Re-ordination was never condemned by the *Gallican Church*. A. It is no wonder it was never formally condemned, for no such question was ever started among them: But that they did, on the matter, condemn it, is evident: For they always held their own Ordination, without a Bishop, to be valid, Which is inconsistent with Re-ordination; allowing the validity of ones Baptism with Re-baptism. He would have us think that the Church of England doth not absolutely condemn their Ordination in France: Only she is determined to preserve an unquestionable Succession of Priests within her own bounds. A. Is not this a material, and real condemning of their Ordination (call it absolute, or by what other Epithite you please) that no man who hath no more than that Ordination, may A'mi-

nister Holy things, by the allowance of the Church of England; yes, I could tell him of a *Bishop* (and he was not singular in that Sentiment) in England, who said to a *Presbyterian* Minister, that he looked on him as no better than a *Mechanick*, because he wanted *Episcopal Ordination*: Wherefore it is but a shift, to palliate their shame when they tell us, they do not absolutely deny that *Ordination*: And I believe few of his Brethren in England will give him thanks for his Concession. He pretendeth to refuse a distinction between a *Material Canonical Obedience*, and a *Formal Canonical Obedience*: But hath nothing against it that is Argumentative. It is no great sign of Learning, that a Man who hath lived in, or near an University (as he mocking, saith of Mr. M. whose University Learning none that knoweth him will disparage) doth not understand this distinction: If any Usurper (whether in Church or State) command me to do what is antecedently my duty; I may do the thing so commanded, because it is my duty; here is *Material Obedience*; while yet I do not own the Power by which such an Usurper doth command me; nor would do the thing for his command, if it were not otherwise my duty to do it: Here is a refusing of *Formal Obedience*.

§ 47. Our *Apologist's* last Essay is from p. 58. to let us see the several periods of *Episcopacy* and *Presbytery*, in the Church of Scotland since the Reformation: And this he doth out of a *Manuscript* of a Person of great Honour, and true Learning, Collected out of the ancient Records of Parliament. I hope it will be no derogation from either the great Honour or the true Learning, of that Noble Person (whom I always have regarded as so qualified) to examine modestly what is there offered: Nor to say, that this Honourable and Learned Writer hath not shewed all that Impartiality in this *Manuscript*, that useth to commend a good Historian. While he entertaineth his Reader, not only with some representation of things that may suffer a little Correction; but with harsh words against the *Presbyterians*; calling them (p. 58.) a company of *Arbitrary Presbyters*: That on it (the debate about Parity) followed much Blood, Confusion, Rapine, and other Mischief: And then, and since, every fiery Faction did lay hold on this Schism as a Fond whereon to build all Rebellion and Treason. p. 60. He calleth the General Assembly, a Famous Conventicle, *ibid.* And he speaketh of the *Presbyterians*, new Gospel, *ibid.* Mr. Andrew Melvill, and his fiery Complices, p. 62. What fair History can be expected from a Person (of whatever Honour and Learning he be) who hath formed to himself, and representeth to others, such a monstrous Idea of the Men whom he designeth to Expose. He beginneth his Discourse with a Remark, (which it seems either the Author of the *Manuscript*, or the *Apologist*, or both, taketh for a conclusive Argument against *Presbyterians*) that none of our *Martyrs* spake, or wrote against *Bishops*: But all who write of them, praise them for dutiful submission to their *Bishops*, and Superiours. A. 1. They had so many great abominations in the way that they opposed, to insist on, that it is no wonder they ever lookt this: We know Luther opposed but few things in Popery, at first; now if he had been cut off by Martyrdom in the beginning of his Reformation, as these Worthy Men were; would his Silence have been a good Argument for all these points of Popery that afterward fell under debate? 2. He confesseth the *Martyrs* spake against *Pope's Tyranny* (which I hope he will acknowledge was exercised by the *Bishops*); I ask then, when they did thus condemn Tyranny in *Bishops*, did they own any Lawful Authority they had? Which might have been expected, if they had been of this Writers Opinion. Yea, it can be made appear, that some of them said the *Pope* hath no more power than another Man; and if this be said of the Chief *Bishop*, it may with better reason be said of his Underlings. 3. Where any Historian gave an account of the dutiful submission of these *Martyrs* to their *Bishops* I do not find; except it were while they were still in the Church of Rome, which is not to the purpose in hand. Another Argument he seemeth to bring from *Cromwell*, who turned off *Presbytery* at the Barrow-moor, being wearied with its Confusions and Insolencies. This needeth little answer; I hope this Author will not now own *Cromwell's* Actings, as Exemplary, and Instructive. Beside, that this Act is invidiously, and unfairly represented; For the place, nor the Cause of the Act, was not as here said: *Cromwell* was no Friend to *Episcopacy* more than to *Presbytery*.

§ 48. He saith he will next come to *positive Evidences*, all which are taken out of *Spotwood's History*, except a very few from the History that goeth under the name of *John Knox*, a few *Animadversions*

versions on such Passages as seem to question *Presbytery* being the first Church Government among the Scotch Protestants, is all that I need here to mind. He saith, p. 58 at the end, that five Superintendents were named for the Diocesses where the Bishops were Popish: For there are no Superintendents named for Galloway and Argyle, because the Bishops of these Diocesses were Protestants. This is the Author's conjecture; no such Reason of that Conduct is given by Arch-Bishop Spotswood; cut of whom he taketh his History. And indeed, it is contrary to Reason, as well as without Ground; for there were more Diocesses than six or seven in Scotland; and but two of the Bishops were Protestants (except 1601) why then did they not place Superintendents in the rest of the Diocesses; which behoved (by his own account) either to be Vacant, or furnished with Popish Bishops? Further, He, it seems, hath read the Author that he citeth, very carelessly; for Spotswood saith expressly, that one of the five Superintendents (viz John Kersewell) was placed in Argyle and the Isles: And yet my Antagonist maketh Argyle one of the two Diocesses in which the Bishops were Protestants: There must then be some other Reason for appointing these five Superintendents, and no more; than that the Bishops of these Diocesses were Popish: And it is evident from this very passage, that the Protestants did not own Episcopal Jurisdiction, in any Man, even though he were Protestant; seeing they set a Superintendent in Argyle, where the Bishop was Protestant, and tho' the Bishop of Argyle did then sit in Parliament (as Spotswood hath it, p. 149. near the end) yet the Protestants set another over the Church in that Diocess. And it is also clear from this passage, that they did not look on a Superintendent and a Bishop, as the same, nor as having the same Authority in the Church. The material and great differences that are between a Superintendent (which the Protestant Church in Scotland in that case of necessity, did, for a time, allow at the Reformation) and a Bishop, may be seen at length, in Calderwood's History, p. 26, 27. whom I hope I may, without blame, quote, as well as he doth, that of Arch-bishop Spotswood. If it may be done without giving him offence (which he seemeth to take at my referring to mine own little Books) I would tell him, that all the weight that here, and after, he layeth on Superintendents being set over large districts, is taken off by what the Apologist might have read, and should have answered, if he had dealt fairly, 1st. *Vindic.* p. 10.

§ 49. The next thing that the Manuscript taketh notice of is, p. 59. That a Commission of the Assembly met at Lieth, 1572, in January, and agreed that vacant Bishopricks should be supplied: That Spiritual Jurisdiction should be exercised by Bishops: And that Ministers should be Ordained by them, or by Superintendents, where there were no Bishops: And that in August after, a General Assembly at Perth approved of all these Articles: And that Mr. Andrew Melvil, because not made a Bishop, stirred up one Mr. Dury, 1573 to impugn the Episcopal Order, and all imparity; and that this was the first time that this Debate was tossed in our Church, which divided Church and State, &c. I shall with all due respect to his Lordship examine this History. And 1. I observe, that he bringeth no Vouchers for these passages; but we must take, on his own single Testimony, things that were beyond the memory or knowledge of his Father; of much more than a hundred years standing. 2. Arch-bishop Spotswood expressly saith, p. 260. That these Articles were admitted by the Assembly at Perth only for an interim, till a more perfect Order might be obtained from the King, Or Regent: And what that Order was, time did try; for not Episcopacy was afterward settled; but Presbytery. 3. It is a great mistake that they who made these Articles were a Commission of the Assembly, for that Meeting at Lieth was no General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, tho' Spotswood is pleased to call it so: Both Calderwood p. 49. and Perrie Cent. 16. p. 372 witness, that in the Register it is called a Convention; which word is always used for extraordinary Meetings, whether of Church or State. That Meeting did indeed Vote it self a General Assembly: For in the second Session, it was concluded that this Meeting should have the force and strength of a General Assembly; and that all things may be treated, and ended therein, that use to be treated and ended in a General Assembly. Also that the Moderator of the last Assembly shall continue till the next ordinary Assembly in March: And that all presents should be there also. So both the Historians last cited. All this sheweth, that this was no Assembly, clothed with the Authority of the Church of Scotland; and therefore its Acts were Null, and not binding: Besides, that it is ex-

pressly told us, That they who there met were only Commissioners from some Towns and Churches, who
 the Superintendents, and Commissioners for Visitation, 3. What was there concluded, was not by the
 Convention of Church men, but seven of them were delegated, who, or any four of them, should
 meet with such of the Secret Council as the Regent should appoint, and these were they who made
 this Innovation in the Church, by the Articles above mentioned. I hope none will say, that this was
 a Church Meeting, or what they did was the deed of the Church. 4. It is certain that this was not
 looked on by the Church of Scotland as one of her General Assemblies: Not only because the General
 Assembly, appointed by the former Assembly, met at St. Andrews, a few Weeks after that Convention
 at Leith, viz. March 6. but likewise, they took no notice of the Arch-bishop of St. Andrews,
 who he sat among them, but chused Mr. Robert Hamilton, Minister of St. Andrews, to be their
 Moderator: Which they could not have done, had they owned a Prelacy in the Church. 5. It is
 known that this Act at Leith was disliked, and witnessed against, by such as were not influenced by the
 Court, and by some Noble Men, who were making their own Gain by this new Constitution: And
 that it raised great Division: Patrick Adamson, in a Sermon, distinguished My Lord Bishop, viz.
 Such as were in the Popish Church. My Lords Bishops, viz. Such as the Lords had now devised, for
 their own advantage: And The Lord's Bishop, that is every Minister of the Gospel. Mr. Knox, having
 preached in St. Andrews, the Earl of Marston being present, refused to inaugurate the new chosen
 Bishop of St. Andrews, Mr. John Douglas: And he denounced Anathema to the Giver, and also to
 the Receiver. On this occasion Berze writ to Mr. Knox (his Epistle is extant among his Epistles, it is
 dated April 32. 1572.) applauding "The pure Religion, and good Order that were settled in Scotland,"
 "and beseeching that they would hold fast these two; and to remember that if the one be lost the other
 cannot long continue. The following words of that Epistle are remarkable: "As Bishops brought
 in the Papacy, so false Bishops, the Relicks of Popery, shall bring in Epicurism, to the World. They
 that desire the Churches good and safety let them take heed of this Pestilence: And seeing ye have
 put that plague to flight timoussly, I heartily pray you that ye never admit it again; albeit it seem
 plausible, with the presence, or colour of keeping Unity; which pretence deceived the ancient Fa-
 thers: Yea, even many of the best of them. 6. The Bishops that then were set up, had little more
 than the Title, and therefore were called Tuleban Bishops: For the Church had the power: The Bi-
 shops power being expressly made no greater than that of the Superintendents, and being subject to the
 Church: And the Noblemen had the better part of the Benefices. 7. At the same
 time were brought in also Abbots and Priests, as well as Bishops; and for the same end, viz. That
 some Great Men, under their shadow, might reap the profits, only the Name, and some small Re-
 maining to them: So that this whole contrivance was purely, and evidently a piece of State Policy,
 not any inclination of the Church of Scotland to cast off Presbyterian Government, altho' some Church
 Men were drawn in to it. 8. This Constitution never obtained in the Church of Scotland, For not only
 the names of Arch-bishops, and Deans were protested against in the Assembly, March 6. 1572. But
 never a Bishop was offered to Moderate in any of the subsequent General Assemblies; and in several
 Assemblies Acts were made against Bishops, till at last, the General Assembly at Dundee, which be-
 gan July 12. 1580. did absolutely condemn the Office of Bishop, as then used; and commanded
 all Bishops to forbear the exercise of such Power: And to this effect appointed them to appear before
 the several Provincial Synods, where they lived. And afterward, Ann. 1592. Presbyterian Government
 was fully settled. 9. The Account given of Mr. Melvil is not fair; not only in that his opposition to
 Bishops is imputed to his not being preferred. For he was zealously opposite to Episcopacy before
 and when he came to Scotland he refused Preferment at Court, when offered: But also, that the op-
 position that Mr. Dury, and others, made to Episcopacy is ascribed to his instigation. These Le-
 ned, and Worthy Men acted from their own light, and were not Tools to be used by another. An
 opposition was made to Episcopacy before Mr. Melvil came to Scotland; as is clear from what is
 above said: Wherefore it was not the first starting of that Debate, when Mr. Dury appeared in the
 Assembly, 1575.

§ 50. I could not have expected from a Person of *Honour and Learning*, such an account of the *Book of Policy* made in the year 1578. As *Thargis* was stuffed with the Spirit of *Mr. Andrew Melvil* himself; it was rather a proposal for overthrowing of all just Authority, than an Establishment of a Religious Government. That it could not (even in these distracted and furious times) obtain approbation of any Authority. But was looked on as a Rapidity of groundless Assertions, and full of mischievous Novelties. This is not to write like an Historian. His Author, *Spoiswood*, speaketh with more modesty of this matter: That the *Book of Policy* being presented to the States, they had not then leisure to peruse it; but gave a Commission to some of their number to confer with the Commissioners of the Church. And if they did agree, to insert the same among the Acts of Parliament. So be, p. 289. That it was not rejected with such disdain, as his Lordship is pleased to express, is evident; not only in that nothing of such resentment of it, when proposed, is left on Record, by any Historian; but in the fierce Zeal of a new Set of *Episcopalians*; not the temper of the old *Protestant Church of Scotland*; but *Archbishop Spoiswood* p. 289. to 302. Setteth down all the Articles of that Book at length, and on his Margin, noteth what was agreed to, what was referred to farther reasoning, and what amendments of it were desired by the other Party. It is also observed by *Caldernood*, p. 116. That the delay of studying the *Book of Policy*, by the State, was much occasioned by what is contained in the eighth ninth and Tenth Chapters of it, concerning the disposing the *Church Assets*, otherwise than some great Men desired, and to their disadvantage, as they imagined. A piece of manifestly false History followeth, viz. *Ann.* 1580. 'An Assembly met at *Dunfermline*, called by Mr. Andrew and his Associates, without a shadow of any permission from the Civil Authority: Where they declared the Office of a Bishop to be without warrant from the Word of God. That they had not the Magistrates allowance is not only said without the Authority of any Historian, and is a pure invention of this Author: But it is certain, that then they had their *Assemblies*, in Course, by the States allowance, and that the succeeding Assembly was appointed at the dissolution of the former. It is also asserted by *Caldernood*, p. 29. That 'the King sent two; the Prior of *Pittenweem*, and the Laird of *Lundie*, instructed with power to assist the Assembly with their Presence, and Council; from all which it is also evident to be a mistake, that this Assembly was called by Mr. Melvil and his Associates. The observation of our Author on the *Assemblies* declaring against Bishops, is the ordinary Cant of his Party: that it is against plain Scripture, the Doctrine of the Apostles (how this differs from the former I know not) and of the Fathers, and the Canons of all Oecumenical Councils, and the rule of *Apollitical and Primitive Practice*. If he, or any else, will prove all this our Cause must needs fall to the ground: But I have often read, and heard such confident Assertions, but never yet saw sufficient proof of them. It offendeth him highly, that in the end of the Act against Bishops, the Assembly referreth to the next Assembly to reason upon the disposing the Patrimony of the Kirks possessed by the Bishops; as if in that they usurped on the Kings Regale. But here is not one word of considering how they should dispose of this Patrimony, and I hope it is no Usurpation in Churchmen, to advise and reason, in order to give their Opinion, and putting up their Supplication to them in whom it belongeth to dispose of it.

§ 51. His History of one *Montgomery*, who was zealous against Bishops, and yet did afterward Simoniacally bargain for a Bishoprick, I regard not: Not knowing the truth of it; nor being directed by him whither to find it: And if it were true, it signifieth no more, but that once a professed Presbyterian was an Apostate: Which is so insignificant a story, and so little Argumentative in our Debate, that it is not worthy the writing. He misrepresents the procedure of the Church against *Montgomery*, viz. that when they were called to answer for illegal intrusions on the Kings Authority, they did boldly profess, that they were composed in Godliness to the King; yet they did not acknowledge the Kings own Councils right in any Ecclesiastical matter. I wish this Author had either read *Spoiswood's History* (for others it is like he will not regard them) more carefully; or represented what account he giveth of this matter more faithfully: Which is (p. 316. &c.) that Mr. Robert *Montgomery*, Minister at *Stirling*, having made a vile Simoniacal bargain for the Bishoprick of *Glasgow*, was quarrelled by the Church,

Church, for this, and other gross things were also laid to his charge: The King allowed them to proceed against him on any thing they could charge him with in his Life, or Doctrine: But would not permit them to censure him for accepting the *Bishprick*: Whereupon he was accused of gross Crimes; his Libel was sent to the King: The King left him to make his own Answer. After this the *Presbytery of Stirling* suspended him for disorderly Baptizing, he slighted this Sentence, and exercised his Ministry. Whereupon he was cited to appear before the *Synod*; of which the King being informed, warned the *Synod* to appear before him at *Stirling*; and discharged all proceeding against him; some of them appeared, and protested, that tho' in *Obedience* (not *Creed*, as our Author hath it) they had compeared, yet they did not acknowledge his Majesty; and the Council, Judges in the matter, it being a Cause Ecclesiastical: They did not say, as the Manuscript hath it, that they did not acknowledge the King and Councils right in any Ecclesiastical matter. I shall say no more of this purpose; save that, not only the *Presbyterians*; but also not a few *Episcopalians* (especially when the Civil Authority seth against their Interests, and Inclinations) do controvert, whether the Magistrate can hinder the Church to censure her own Members; when the matter is purely Ecclesiastical. I wish our Author would shew us what Invasion is made on the Kings Authority, when the Church censures any person for Immoralities, that are manifest Scandals to the People, and do no way touch the Civil State.

§ 52. He next, p. 61. maketh an odious representation of the Kings being made Prisoner as Rurven by some of the Nobility, and the General Assemblies approving of this Fact. It is here, in the first place to be observed; that this is wide from the design of the *Apologist*, in transcribing this Manuscript. The tendency of it is indeed to set forth the *Presbyterians* in as ugly a shape as is possible; which I confess our *Apologist* is passionately bent upon; but it no way contributeth to shew the Vicissitudes of *Presbytry* and *Episcopacy* in the Church of Scotland; for which he bringeth this Manuscript. Next I take notice, that he who wrote this Paper doth not give so fair account of this affair as his Author, *Sponswood*, doth, who informeth us, p. 320. &c. That 'some of the Nobility combining themselves, for defence of Religion, and the liberty of the Kingdom (as they pretended) did seize the King; and restrained the Duke of Lennox and the Earl of Argyll (whose Councils had given great discontent to the Nation; from the Kings presence: That the King, by a Proclamation, approved of the Act; discharged aising of Men to rescue him, commanded the Duke and Earl to depart out of the Nation: That the Queen of England advised the King to take in good part what the Lords had done; because of the danger that the perverse Councils of the Duke of Lennox and Earl of Argyll had brought the Nation into. That the Noblemen desired the General Assembly to approve this deed of theirs; which the Assembly would not do, till they consulted with the King himself; and till he desired them to do it: Consulting to them that Religion was in hazard; and indirect Courses taken to overturn it; and that his own hazard was joyned with that of Religion: And desiring that they for their own part, would help to remove the same. He sheweth also that 'this deed of the Lords was fully approved by a Convention of Estates at Edinburgh; called by the Kings. Let it then be considered, whether it be so monstrous a thing for the Church to shew her Opinion, when required, In concurrence with the King, and Estates of the Nation; whether the King did really think what he expressed, or what he acted was the effect of his restraint, it was not their part to consider. He quarrelleth also with the Ministers appointing a Fast, when the King desired the Magistrates of Edinburgh to Feast the French Ambassadors. These Ambassadors came to overturn what the States of the Nation, called by the King, had concluded, and were odious to the Nation: The King was moved to appoint this Entertainment, by some Merchants, who Traded with France: The Fast was appointed by the Session of Edinburgh, the Presbytry was free of it, as was afterward publicly declared.

§ 33. Mr. Andrew Melvil's declining of the King as Judge in *prima instantia*, of what is preached by Ministers in public which he bringeth as an accusation against the *Presbyterians* p. 61. is as far from the purpose, as what was formerly observed: It doth not shew any step of the prevalency of *Presbytery* and *Episcopacy per vices*; which is pretended to be the design of the *Manuscript*. For the thing itself I shall not give any Opinion; but only relate the Grounds alledged by him, on which he built this his practice; which were not only the word of God; but Acts of Parliament, and a late Conference betwixt some Lords of the Privy Council, and some Ministers, and the practice ensuing thereupon; that when a Minister is delated for any thing spoken in *Teaching*, or *Prayer*, he is first to be arayed by his Ordinary; whether *Provincial* or *General Assembly*. Also he pleadeth the Privilege of the University of *St. Andrews*, lately confirmed by his Majesty; that when Offences were committed in the University, by Masters or Students, the Rector and his Assistants should be Judges in *prima instantia*, p. 61. 62. He heapeth together a great multitude of reproaches against Mr. Andrew Melvil, and others of the faithful Servants of God, who could not comply with the actings of the Court, nor delight of some about it, to overturn the Religion settled in the Nation; but he giveth so indistinct an account of things, and so partially, that there is no other way to answer what he saith, but by a full History of these times; which it is needless for me to transcribe. The Reader may be satisfied of this Authors unfauldealing; even out of *Spotswood's History*, though his account of things might in some things be examined: But more fully out of *Calderwood* and *Petrie*. I do not deny, but that in the years 1585, and some that followed, there were great Animosities in Church and State; one Party endeavouring to preserve the reformed Religion and the Discipline of the Church, that had been used in *Scotland* from the Reformation; and was practised in almost all the Reformed Churches: The other Party labouring to overturn the one, and to weaken and undermine the other. And it is like these heats did drive both Parties to some Excesses and undue Practices: But unbiassed Men will see that the *Presbyterian* Party shewed all respect to Authority, even when they could not comply with its Injunctions; and what they did, that is by some constructed *Unpeaceableness*, was from the aw of God obliging them to appear in their Stations for his Ordinances: I except the imperfections, and overlashes that sinful Men are liable to, in managing that Zeal which is for God. I never thought that good Men did always manage a good Cause with that perfection of discretion that is to be wished. He concludeth this Accusation of the Brethren p. 62. with an account of his design, which is to shew the ground of their dislike of *Variety*: And as before, setteth in opposition to it, *Scripture*, *Apostolick Practice*, *Fathers*, *Councils*, and all well established Christian Churches, and that there is no imaginable warrant for it from any of these. This is partly answered above: For what he addeth to what he had said before, of well established Churches; he doth wisely in putting the Emphasis on *Well*; and therefore putteth that word in another Character: For if we object most of the Churches of the Reformation, he will deny them to be *Well* Established, because they want *Bishops*: Whatever they have beside to commend them. If we should muster up all the miscarriages of the *Episcopal* Party, and the Immoralities of Ministers and People that hath been among them; and the Pride, Tyranny, and Oppression of the *Bishops*; and the steps by which that interest hath been managed in *Scotland*; and should give a just Character of the States-men and Church-men, by whom it hath been carried on: It is like we might give a ground of our dislikes of *Episcopacy*, not inferior to what he mentioneth; and much more weighly with all the true Lovers of serious Religion; but this way of Arguing is not what we lay much weight on, in debate with our Adversaries: Tho' I doubt not but that there is reason to think that what which is Christ's Institution is usually found to be a more effectual mean for advancing true Religion in the Church, than that which is a device of Man.

§ 34. Our Author near the end of p. 62. maketh a great Concession (as he seemeth to imagine) when he telleth us, that in 1591, 1591, and 1602: The King being so often brought into danger and trouble, by the Seditious of Mr. Andrew Melvil, and his Party Complices, did consent to grant a great deal of Jurisdiction to Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies. Here I take notice, 1. That when he cannot get the Truth denied, he endeavourerth to smother it; for not only a great deal of

M

Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction was granted to the *Presbyterian Church* 1592, but all Church Power that any *Presbytery* did lay claim to, was by Law, settled on the *Presbyterian Church* *Judicatories*; and none at all either given, or left to *Bishops*: For what else can be understood by *ratifying* all immunities and freedoms whatsoever, given and granted by his Highness, his Regents in his Name, many of his Predecessors; and at the same time, *ratifying* and approving *General Assemblies* appointed by the *Y^e Kirk*, and *Synods*, and *Presbyteries*, and *particular Sessions*; and the words of the Act of Parliament. Moreover, that Act is conceived in a *statute* supposing *Presbytery* to be then, and to have been before, the Government established in the Church of Scotland; while it giveth these Liberties to the True and Holy Church presently established within their Realm. His pretence, that this was force on the King, to prevent Seditions, to avert civil dissensions: For the King had often shewd dislike of the one way, and the other, and was far rather of them as his Interest led him, not being convinced of the Justness of either way. Therefore the letter of *Chancellor Maitland's* advice, to settle *Presbytery*, sheweth that they would make themselves odious, rather than his Opinion; as in this he proved not a true Prophet. That there was no Act for the abolishing *Episcopacy* (as p. 63.) was no wonder; for it was as needless as when it is appointed a Tree shall be cut up by the Root: no other injunction being given that the Tree shall fall: Was not *Episcopacy* effectually rooted up in Scotland, when all Church Power was put in the hands of *Church Judicatories*, where all Members acted in Party. That a *Bishop* baptised *Prince Henry*, is an odd Argument to prove that *Episcopacy* was the Government of the Church of Scotland. If the King was pleased to chuse a Man who once exercised *Episcopal Jurisdiction*, for that Service, especially when Ambassadors were present, some of which lived where *Episcopacy* was exercised; is not that follow that either this *Bishop*, or any other of his Character, did govern the Church. It is false in our *Witness* p. 63. That when the Lords were tried, the witnesses would make order to be dressed and shined up like Rabble to back them; nor would they stand, who prohibited by *Proclamations* from King and Council. The true History of some Popish Plot was known, all the Nation over, to be guilty of dangerous plotting against the Reformed Religion, and deluged in the Professions of it: They had Friends at Court, so that they had too much advantage to carry on their designs: All the *Stand Protestants* in the Nation observed this, and saw the danger that they, and the true Religion was in: wherefore a Meeting of *Burgh Members*, and *Ministers* (which when challenged by the King for their meeting, offered to make it appear that it was not sufficient without advice from his Majesty) did petition the King that the Lords might be brought to Trial; which was appointed to be done; the Protestants resolved to meet before hand to appoint some to prosecute the Criminals, which they did: Neither can it be made appear, if any violence was offered to any Person; and all that *Episcopal* faith of it is, p. 39. that great Companies came to *Edinburgh*; without mention of Arms or Violence: And indeed the danger was such, as it is no wonder that they who had God for the true Religion were forced to cry for Justice, when they evidently saw that all Methods were used to palliate the manner, and protect the Criminals, to the manifest hazard of Church and State. The Issue was, when Convocation called by the King for trying these Lords, referred the matter to a Committee, where they allowed some Ministers, whom they named, to depose them; and to propose what they should think fit: Here is nothing of Ministers ordering the Process, nor of a Rabble in a stir: do you read and

§ 45. After all this, our Author doth still maintain, that in the year 1606 *Presbytery* had not the ascendancy, for *Bishops* slide still by Law, enjoyed their Stalls, and preached in their Churches; in which he produceth many passages out of the Records of *Edinburgh*. *Grinwell* our Author is silent to this Issue, if it be all that he would prove, he shal not stand so to oppose him. Our question only, whether the *Protestant Church* after her Reformation, was governed by *Bishops* or by *Presbytery* acting in Party. I show that long after the Reformation, even *Popish Bishops* sat in Parliament, enjoyed their Temporalities: And that in 1574 *Archbishops* and *Bishops* were introduced, and also *Abbots* and *Priors*; but even they perceived Power that they began to lose, was soon taken away: And that many State-men who composed most of the profits of these places made a great stride to the

up that image, yea, and to give them more power in the Church than was due: But that in these times *Bishops* had ruling Church power (except in 1372. as is said) I utterly deny: Wherefore most of his Citations are wholly beside the purpose. I shall then only examine such of them as seem to make against what I have asserted. He saith p. 84. That the *Authority of the Bishops is owned by Act 63. Parl. 5. Jac. 6. Ann. 1575* of which none of our Histories do take any notice: And the Act itself is, *anent the visitation of Hospitals*, all that is said of *Bishops* is, that they, and other Commissioners of Dioceses, shall visit Hospitals. I hope here is no Church power allowed them. In the year 1579. Act 71. Parl. 6. Jac. 6. there is no more said, but that *young Noblemen or others, who had been out of the Country for their breeding, shall at their return go to the Bishop, or Superintendent, or Commissioner of the Kirk*. Neither is this any governing Authority over the Church. The two following Citations are only to shew, that *Bishops* continued 1583, so that of 1587, and several others of his Quotations, design no more, but that *Bishops* existed by Law, as in Parliament, some were *appointed to rich Benefices*: All which is wide from the purpose. He saith that 1584, Act 132. Parl. 3. Jac. 6. the *Bishops Authority is fully owned*. It is indeed said in that Act, That Ministers may be deposed by the ordinary Bishop of a Diocese; or others the Kings Majesties Commissioners, to be constituted in Ecclesiastical Causes: Where it is evident, that Church power is placed in the King, rather than in the Bishop: Who can by this Act do nothing but as he is the Kings Commissioner, even in censuring of Ministers: If this be a full owning of *Episcopal* power, let him enjoy it: This making them the Kings Bishops not Christs; nor is there any thing beside in that Act, which alloweth them any Church power. But we have another Answer to this Quotation: That Parliament (saith Spotswood p. 333.) was declared Current at that time, for the more speedy dispatch of business; whereas the former was in October 1581, and is called in the Records the seventh Parl: and this is called the eighth Parliament; which is inconsistent with its being Current; or the former Parliament yet subsisting: But some things were to be done, that could not pass in a full Parliament; and therefore, as Calderwood hath it, p. 155, there was no intimation by Proclamation before the meeting of it; nor reasonable time granted, according to the accustomed order. It was almost ended before it was heard of: The Lords of the Articles were sworn to keep secret the matters to be treated. One of whom, tho' he would not reveal particulars, wrote to a Minister, that the whole intent of that Parliament was against the Kirk and the Discipline of it. These are the Methods by which *Episcopacy* and *Erastianism* behaved to be supported in these times, when they could have no Countenance from the Church, nor from the Nation.

S. 56. He next citeth a Conference at Falkland, 1396 where some Articles were agreed on, about some Ministers having Vote in Parliament, and that these were confirmed by an Assembly at Montross 1600, and there some Bishops Elected for Diocesses. It is not to be denied, that there was a working toward Prelacy among some Courtiers, and Ambitious Churchmen, about that time: And one of their Methods was, to get some Ministers to Vote in Parliament; the tendency of this was seen, and the thing opposed by good Men: And even in Parliament it met with such opposition, that they hardly carried it. Yea, the making the Voter in Parliament for the Church perpetual, and that he should not be chosen yearly, was carried but by three Votes: However this was the beginning of that *Popularity* that afterward came to a greater height, and the design of setting up Bishops did soon appear, however they for a time did labour to cover it. That which I chiefly observe here is, that this sticke that then was made for setting up some Ministers to Vote in Parliament, is an evidence against the whole of this Manuscript, viz. That Bishops did not then, nor always exist in the Reformed Church of Scotland: For if they had, they were the Men who should have sat in Parliament, to represent the Church; and there needed not such steps for bringing them into the Church. The story of Mr. Dury's Recantation at his Death, and owning *Episcopacy*, I find not in any of the Histories that I can meet with; neither hath our Author directed us whereto find it: And if it were true, it proveth no more but that all and every one of the *Presbyterians* were not faithful to the end. For the General Assembly at Bruntsford 1603, which he mentioneth; I have nothing to observe about it: For he alleged nothing.

thing there done toward the advancing of *Episcopacy*. Next he telleth us of an *Assembly*, at the *Lyons House*, and of the *Kings Clemency* to some *Ministers*: And his proposals for *Provisions*, both for *Bishops* and *Presbyters*; this was 1602. Here is a great mistake: The King did not mention *Bishops* in his Proposals, as they are set down by *Spiswood*, p. 468. The overtures about this were made by the *Assembly* at the *Kings desire*. Neither are *Bishops* there mentioned. The words are, The *Prelacies* should be disposed to *actual Ministers*, Churches annexed thereto being provided sufficiently, and the tenth of the *Superplus* paid to the King, or otherwise that all the great *Benefices* be dissolved; the *Prelate* enjoying the *Principal Church* and *Temporal Lands*; and the Churches annexed disposed to *Ministers*: Both they and the *Prelate* paying a yearly duty to the King. Where I take notice, 1. That *Prelate*, in the *Dialect* of that time, did rather signify an *Abbot* or *Prior*, than a *Bishop*: At least when ever it is used in the *History* of that time especially, by *Spiswood*, it comprehendeth all the three. Wherefore, 2. It cannot be gathered from this passage, that *Bishops* did otherwise exist than *Abbots* and *Priors*: That is, that some Church-men had the *Titler*, and some States-men had the *Revenues*, but neither of both had Church Authority above ordinary *Ministers*. And 3. This is clear, that before this, Men had these *Prelacies* who were not actually *Ministers*: Which maketh plainly against the existence of *Diocesan Bishops* with *Governing power*, at that time. 4. The dissolution of all great *Benefices*, that is there propounded by way of *Alternative* doth shew, that it was not the mind of that *Assembly* that either *Bishops*, or *Abbots*, or *Priors* should continue so much, as to enjoy the *Temporalities* that formerly they possessed; so far is it from designing that *Bishops* should be provided for, and advanced, as such: It only provideth for the *Minister* of the place, where a *Lord Bishop* once ruled.

§. 57. His Assertion of the activity of hot headed *Presbyters* in stirring up prejudices against the Church of England: And his high Elogies of that Church, which he insisteth on p. 66. I shall not stand upon; seeing he hath neither mentioned particulars nor given any ground for what he affirmeth. If *Presbyters* were then active to preserve the Government of the Church then established; it was a reasonable and necessary duty, that every one was bound to make Conscience of in his station. For then might they rationally fear that the King who had been influenced by some Corrupt Men, to oppose the settling of *Presbytry*, would now be more bent, and had more advantage, to overturn it, as indeed it fell out. In the business of the *Assembly at Aberdeen*, which he aggravatech with all his Rhetorick, I shall not interpose my Opinion: I find it diversly represented, by divers Historians. I am sure whatever be made of it, he cannot draw from it this conclusion, that *Episcopacy* then took place in Scotland, which is the design of his *Manuscript*. The tale that concludeth the *Manuscript* about the *Chancellour* and the *Ministers*, I find not in *History*, nor are we directed where it is to be sought for, and therefore I neglect it, being assured that these Men who had appeared so much, and with too much hazard, against *Papery*, would not be guilty of conniving at it.

§. 58. The *Apologist* having transcribed this *Manuscript* from p. 67. maketh a number of Inferences from it. All which do fall to the ground by the answers already given to the Paper it self, which is the foundation of them: And most of them are particularly obviated in what hath been said. The 1. is answered §. 47. where it is shewed, our Martyrs had no occasion to consider the Government of the Church, being exercised about greater points, that needed Reformation. That the first Reformation submitted to the *Episcopal Jurisdiction* of Protestant *Bishops*; is absolutely false: For he cannot make it appear that any such Jurisdiction was exercised at, or soon after the Reformation. The 2d. That *Episcopacy* was never legally abolished, is disproved §. 54. That *Presbyterians* always watched the difficult Circumstances of the King, which is the third, is not true: They did in all Circumstances endeavour to settle the Discipline and Order of the Church. His fourth, asserting the *Presbyterians* pleading exemptions from the *Secular Powers*, as the *Papists*, is not only false, but diametrically affirmed. The 5th is answered §. 44. The 6th, *Episcopacy* was not quarrelled, as unlawful in self, in these times. Not only is no way deducible from any thing said in the *Manuscript*: But is false; and affirmed against the clearest light that such a matter is capable of: Doth not even the *Book of Discipline* (in which all the *Presbyterians* of these times agreed) declare *Episcopacy* to be contrary to the word

word of God; while say, ad. it saith, *He (God) willeth that they should rule with mutual consent as Brethren, with an equality of Power, every one according to their Function.* And there are four ordinary Offices in the Kirk of Christ; the Office of Pastor, Minister, or Bishop; the Doctor, the Presbyter, or Elder; and the Deacon: And after, no more Offices ought to be received, or suffered in the Church of Christ established according to his word.

§. 19. For the Eighth. Whatever he fancy of the Royal Authority being forced to all that was granted to the Presbyterians: Let him answer for this Imputation of Hypocritie and Dissembling in the King that then was; It is enough to us, that the Church Power was granted to Presbyterians, by King and Parliament: and that they declared they did it willingly and sincerely. The Tenth (according to his wonted Charity and Candor) maketh the *Vindicator's* Book to be one intire *Shuffle* from top to bottom: And his ground is, *the Presbyterians of old did some very ill things*: And yet the *Vindicator* would persuade the World, that Presbyterians are not capable of such Villanies, as the rabbling of the Clergy. I wish he would learn to speak Truth, and to use a little more Reason in his Discourses. The *Vindicator* hath said nothing of the Capacity of Presbyterians: They are sinful Men, and capable of very bad things, if the Lord leave them: All that was asserted (and it is made evident against all his attempts) is, that the Presbyterians did not do such things, as he, and others of his Gang, charge them with. For these odious things that he chargeth the Presbyterians of the former age with: Enough hath been said for their Vindication by others; tho' I had been silent. Let him read Mr. *Baillies* pieces, and answer them if he can. His impugning of the distinction between *Cameronians* and *Sober Presbyterians*, hath been answered before; but he loveth to repeat, rather than to say nothing. The Eleventh Inference is, That Presbyterians have no principle of Unity; because the lesser number may remonstrate against the greater, so as to stop the course of Discipline. This last Clause is groundless: For the greater part of a Church meeting may go on in the exercise of Discipline, whatever be remonstrated to the contrary, by the lesser part; nor doth the *Manuscript* give any ground to think that Discipline could not be exercised because some did remonstrate against it. For the former part of his Inference, I gladly would know, whether that principle of Unity be owned among his Party; that none may remonstrate against what the Bishop or the greatest part of the meeting doth. If so then the Consciences of Men like *Issachar's* Ass, must tamely couch under the burden of whatever is imposed: And if my Lord Bishop, and the plurality of his Clergy, decide all the Controversies between us and Papists on the side of the *Romish Synagogue*, no man may mutter, or reclaim. It was an ancient Maxim, even in the Canon Law, *Civis supplicare & protestari licet*. To deny this is to banish Conscience, or to bring in that Atheistical Principle, that our Actions must be directed not by our own, but by the publick Conscience. The last Inference doth not differ from the former, but to make up the round dozen, he hath put it in other words which labour under the same evil that he there chargeth others with, viz. *General words, which as the bottom have no particular signification*: For he chargeth us with Tyranny, Disobedience, poisonous Principles, that we lie in the face of Authority, &c. And all this made out by the protestation against the General Assembly, 1651, which he setteth down at length. We have now (through the mercy of God) buried that unhappy difference: And the Revivers of it should reflect on the Builders of *Jericho*. I shall only say as before, that to condemn all Protections and Remonstrances against any company of Men who pretend to Church Authority, or against whatever a Lawful Authority doth, is to take from Ministers, and People, the liberty of protesting and owning the Truth of God.

I have now done with this *Apology*. The Postscript I meddle not with, it is in answer to a Paper, The Author of which can make a Reply, if he thinketh fit.

FINIS.

ERRATA

PAGE 6. l. 13, read declamation. Ibid. l. 16, r. stamp. p. 7. l. 13 (after &c.)
p. 8. l. 23, r. doth: For, p. 28, l. 56, r. p. 29, l. 47, r. flame.
p. 25, l. 47, r. pratoris and pratoris, p. 35, l. 19, r. ceremony.